

Capt. Leonard George Tate Perkins, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Harold Lincoln Gard, Pharmacy Corps, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Joe Edward McKnight, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Homer Clarence McCullough, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Joseph Carmack, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Capt. Louis Felix Williams, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Capt. Frank Randle Day, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

To be major with rank from July 21, 1943

Capt. Paul Christian Borup, Pharmacy Corps.

To be captains with rank from July 12, 1943

First Lt. Carrol Conrad Barrick, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. Thomas Raymond Jones, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Cornelius John Curran, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Gerard Adrien Belanger, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Guy Wycoff Harlow, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. Wilfred Arthur Emond, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Harland William Layer, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Eugene Gordon Cooper, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. Arthur Melville Henderson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Eli Egbert Daman, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Everett Walter Partin, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Andy Vaughan Little, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Omar Kenneth Andrews, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Frank Stepczyk, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Jacob Bruce Martin, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. Harry John Nelson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. James Thomas Johnson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Glenn Keith Smith, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Howard Brim Nelson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

First Lt. Leonard Paul Zagelow, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 12, 1943

Second Lt. Claud Dale La Fors, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Bernard Korn, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Ennis Dallas Sandberg, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Thomas Richards, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Paul Cable Larnce, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Emerson Beery Taylor, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Thomas Floris Criswell, Jr., Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Woodrow Charles Herbert, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Elliott Powell Rigsby, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major).

To be first lieutenant with rank from September 11, 1943

Second Lt. Edward Casimir Rogowski, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain).

LXXXIX—478

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of our salvation, from whom alone all just designs and righteous judgments proceed, Thou makest hope to spring eternal in the human breast. We thank Thee for all the loveliness that summer unfolds through flower and field and forest, as by still waters and green pastures our jaded spirits have been restored. We are grateful for happy memories like quiet pools that mirror peace.

In weary and wearing days freighted with stress and strain, help us to listen beyond the tumult of the world to voices heard only in gentle stillness. May we take the anxious and restless striving of our perplexed generation and set it against the wider background of Him with whom a day is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day. Through the blare of today's blatant voices, with steady faith may we march to the beat of a distant drum that selfish hearts can never hear. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 15, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF CHARLES E. CASSIDY TO BE THIRD JUDGE OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT, HAWAII

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and in accordance with the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of September 24, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Charles E. Cassidy, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, for the Territory of Hawaii. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

JURISDICTION OF SERVICE COURTS OF FORCES OF FRIENDLY FOREIGN NATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State relating to an exchange of notes in which the British Government recognized the right of

the service courts and authorities of the United States to exercise exclusive jurisdiction in respect of criminal offenses that might be committed in the United Kingdom by members of the United States armed forces, and transmitting a draft of proposed legislation "To implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign forces within the United States, and for other purposes" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Letters from departments and agencies of the Government, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service, as follows:

Revised estimates for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, for the Department of the Interior and the Federal Security Agency; and

Quarterly estimate for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, for the Executive Mansion and Grounds.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES DEFERRED FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth monthly list of registrants deferred for occupational reasons because of their employment in or under the Federal Government (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Paola, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF STAFFORD COUNTY (KANS.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the Stafford County (Kans.) Farmers Union which I am glad to present to the Senate and ask that it be appropriately referred. It reads as follows:

Our Stafford County Farmers Union wish to go on record as favoring the following resolution: "In view of the fact that the farmers of the United States have contracted to feed the world, we feel that we should have an even break with industry, and be guaranteed costs plus."

The backbone of the Nation is the farmer, and all these other industries depend on him. Why should he not be protected the same as industry? The farmer must have this consideration.

Yours truly,

Mrs. RALPH HENRY,
Secretary, Stafford County
Farmers Union, Stafford, Kans.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from Kansas will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

As in executive session,
The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Joachim O. Fernandez, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, to fill an existing vacancy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1358. A bill for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1359. A bill for the relief of the Truckee-Carson irrigation district; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1360. A bill to authorize the sale, exchange, or other disposition of certain securities held by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1361. A bill to extend the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, in connection with the public lands, to certain persons serving in the merchant marine and to certain civilian workmen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPORTANCE OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on my desk this morning I found a copy of the *Prairie Farmer*, an excellent farm paper published in my section of the country. Included therein is an editorial entitled "Don't Kill Farm Credit." It is so important, to my way of thinking, that I shall take the time of the Senate to read it into the *Record* as a part of my remarks:

DON'T KILL FARM CREDIT

Bankers seem to have short memories. During the great period of financial rioting with easy money, and stocks and bonds gambling, bankers offered and did lend money to meet the needs. They did not always have enough reserves, but they loaned the money, anyhow.

When firecrackers exploding in the grain pits of the board of trade caused the speculators to run for the nearest exits, when otherwise sensible businessmen realized they were busted and jumped out of seventh-story windows, when pathetic widows stood in line at bank windows to get back money they had invested in foreign bonds upon advice of investment bankers—

Mr. President, if you will pardon me for diverting for a moment from the editorial, let me say that I myself had some of those bonds back in the good old days of 1932, when the bankers of my home town convinced me that 7½ percent bonds were about the safest things in the country. In that one little city of some 4,000 persons, one banker sold to widows, farmers, merchants and people like myself who should have known better, approximately \$125,000 worth of sugar bonds with interest rates of 7½ percent. That type of banker sold his depositors

down the river. It was such irresponsibility that caused so many bank failures.

The editorial continues:

When bankers themselves took the road to foreign parts, walked their ways to prison, or died of broken hearts because of the panic which they were helpless to stop—in those days bankers became humble citizens. They accepted the bank holiday and the flood of Federal funds which came to their banks to stem the tide of panic and restore financial reason to a money greedy world.

Let me further digress to say that so far as the domestic issues of this country are concerned, President Roosevelt will long be remembered for declaring the bank holiday or the bank moratorium, as it was called at that time, saving literally billions of dollars for the depositors of banking institutions. When others at that moment did not have the courage to step forward and declare a moratorium, President Roosevelt did. That is what the editorial is talking about. However, strange as it may seem, many people in this country soon forget what transpired in one of the most critical eras of the United States.

The editorial further says:

Now things are booming again. Bankers' associations, State and national, are forgetting how they failed in their job during the days before the depression. They forget how they hurried during the darkest days of the depression to have farm mortgages bailed out of their banks so that they might have the cash. The Federal farm-land banks did that job.

Farmers who could not get a dime from banks for working capital found lifesaving financial blood in the funds which they could get through the production-credit associations formed so that the business of farming might not be wrecked.

So now when the bankers through their associations square away to talk to Congress, they are in poor position to say that these farm mortgage and working capital branches of the Farm Credit Administration are worthless and that the banks are prepared to meet the financial needs of the country in all emergencies.

Surely their memories are not that short. Their consciences cannot be clear as they stand before the legislators making such an argument for the destruction of the farm credit system which dates back more than 25 years, and which, in a great financial crisis, proved its worth.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AT GALLINGER MUNICIPAL HOSPITAL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is pending on the Senate calendar a resolution reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia at the last session of the Senate. The resolution would authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof to proceed with an investigation of Gallinger Hospital. At this time I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered out of order. In that respect I wish to say I have presented the matter to both the majority leader and the minority leader, and they have given me the green light on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 178) reported by Mr. McCARRAN

from the Committee on the District of Columbia, authorizing an investigation of conditions at Gallinger Municipal Hospital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "patients", to change the period to a colon and insert "Provided, That such committee or subcommittee shall call upon the United States Public Health Service for such professional, technical, or other assistance as it may deem necessary for purposes of the investigation herein authorized," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to investigate conditions at Gallinger Municipal Hospital, with particular reference to sanitation, food, diet, and the treatment and care of tubercular patients: *Provided*, That such committee or subcommittee shall call upon the United States Public Health Service for such professional, technical, or other assistance as it may deem necessary for purposes of the investigation herein authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SECURITY FOR ALL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address entitled "Security for All" broadcast by him over the radio September 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR COLLABORATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address entitled "Post-War Collaboration" delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at Carnegie Hall, New York, on September 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FUTURE OF AVIATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address entitled "The Future of Aviation" delivered by him at Quincy, Ill., on August 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address on the subject of post-war peace delivered by him at a mass meeting held at the Chicago Stadium on September 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW APPROACHES TO PEACE—ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address entitled "New Approaches to Peace" delivered by Hon. Herbert Hoover before the joint session of the St. Paul-Minneapolis branches of the Foreign Policy Association and the University of Minnesota, at Minneapolis, Minn., September 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPEAL TO HUNGARY TO WITHDRAW FROM THE WAR

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an appeal by the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association to Hungary to withdraw from the war, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS OF POLICY ADOPTED BY DIRECTORS, WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements of policy adopted by the directors of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, meeting in Madison, Wis., September 9, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY FOR POST-WAR UNITED STATES—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Policy for Post-War United States," published in the Washington Times-Herald for July 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to strike from the first committee amendment certain language, as amended, beginning on page 2, line 13.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand that there will be discussion of this amendment. The Senate is in the midst of a discussion of this bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is debatable.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very anxious to present a very important report briefly to the Senate. I wonder if the Senator from West Virginia will permit me to proceed for just 5 minutes in that respect?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at the Wednesday session of the Senate—

PROGRESS OF THE WAR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the message just received from the President, as I understand, is directed in part to the matter the Senator from Michigan has in mind, and it seems to me that the message should be laid down first.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is quite satisfactory to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

During the 2-months' recess of the Congress, many important events have occurred at the war fronts and at home. You return at a time when major battles in Europe and in Asia are beginning to be joined. In recent months, the main tides of conflict have been running our way—but we could not and cannot be content merely to drift with this favorable tide.

You know from the news of the past few days that every military operation entails a legitimate military risk and that occasionally we have checks to our plans—checks which necessarily involve severe losses of men and materials.

The Allied forces are now engaged in a very hard battle south of Naples. Casualties are heavy. The desperation with which the Germans are fighting reveals that they are well aware of the consequences to them of our occupation of Italy.

The Congress and the American people can rest assured that the landing on Italy is not the only landing we have in mind. That landing was planned at Casablanca. At Quebec, the leaders and the military staffs of Great Britain and the United States made specific and precise plans to bring to bear further blows of equal or greater importance against Germany and Japan—with definite times and places for other landings on the continent of Europe and elsewhere.

On the 10th of July a carefully prepared expedition landed in Sicily. In spite of heavy German opposition it cleared this large and heavily fortified island in 38 days.

British, Canadian, and American losses in killed, wounded, and missing in the Sicilian campaign were 31,158, of which the American forces lost 7,445. The casualties among the Italians and Germans were approximately 165,000, including 132,000 prisoners.

The unmistakably sincere welcome given to the Allied troops by the Italian people has proved conclusively that even in a country which had lived for a generation under a complete dictatorship—with all of its propaganda, censorship, and suppression of free speech and discussion—the love of liberty was unconquerable.

It has also proved conclusively that this war was not waged by the people of Italy on their own choice. All of Mussolini's propaganda machine could not make them love Hitler or hate us. The less said about the feelings toward Mussolini, the better.

I believe that equal jubilation and enthusiasm will be shown by the people of the other nations now under the German heel when Nazi Gauleiters and native Quislings are removed through force or flight.

How different was this invading army of the Allies from the German forces that had come into Sicily, ostensibly to "protect it." Food, clothing, cattle, medicines, and household goods had been systematically stolen from the people of Sicily, and sent north to the "master race" in Germany. Sicily, like other

parts of Italy, and like the other satellite and conquered nations, had been bled white by the Nazi and Fascist governments. Growers of crops were permitted to retain only a small fraction of their own produce for themselves and their families.

With the Allied armies, however, went a carefully planned organization, trained and equipped to give physical care to the local population—food, clothing, medicine. This new organization is also now in the process of restoring to the people of Sicily freedoms which, for many years, had been denied to them. I am confident that, within a year, Sicily will be once more self-supporting—and, in addition to that, once more self-respecting.

From Sicily the advance of the Allied armies has continued to the mainland. On the third day of September they landed on the toe of the Italian Peninsula. These were the first Allied troops to invade the continent of Europe in order to liberate the conquered and oppressed countries. History will always remember this day as the beginning of the answer to the prayer of the millions of liberty-loving human beings not only in these conquered lands but all over the world.

On July 25—2 weeks after our first landings in Sicily—political events in Italy startled the world. Mussolini, the incubus of Italy for a generation, the man who is more responsible for all of the sorrows of Italy than anyone, except possibly Hitler himself, was forced out of office and stripped of his power as a result of his own dismal failures, his wanton brutalities, and the overwhelming demand of the Italian people. This was the first break in Axis leadership—to be followed, we are determined, by other and similar encouraging downfalls.

But there is one thing I want to make perfectly clear: When Hitler and the Nazis go out, the Prussian military clique must go with them. The war-breeding gangs of militarists must be rooted out of Germany—and out of Japan—if we are to have any real assurance of future peace.

Early last month, the relentless application of overwhelming Allied power—particularly air and sea power—convinced the leaders of Italy that it could not continue an active part in the war. Conversations were begun by them with us. These conversations were carried on with the utmost secrecy. Therefore, much as I wished to do so, I could not communicate the facts of the case to the Congress, or the press, or to those who repeatedly expressed dismay or indignation at our apparent course in Italy. These negotiations turned out to be a complete surprise to nearly everyone, not only to the Axis but to the Italian people themselves.

I am sure that the Congress realizes that there are many situations in this war—and there will be many more to come—in which it is impossible for me to make any announcement or even to give any indication of the policy which

we are following. And I ask the American people as well as the Congress to bear with me and with our chiefs of staff. It is difficult to remain silent when unjustified attack and criticism come from those who are not in a position to have all the facts.

But the people and the Congress can be sure that the policy which we follow is an expression of the basic democratic traditions and ideals of this Republic. We shall not be able to claim that we have gained total victory in this war if any vestige of Fascism in any of its malignant forms is permitted to survive anywhere in the world.

The armistice with Italy was signed on September 3 in Sicily, but it could not be put into effect until September 8, when we were ready to make landings in force in the Naples area. We had planned these landings some time before and were determined to go through with them, armistice or no armistice.

Italian leaders appealed to their Army and Navy to end hostilities against us. Italian soldiers, though disorganized and ill-supplied, have been fighting the Germans in many regions. In conformity with the terms of unconditional surrender, the Italian Fleet has come over to our side; and it can be a powerful weapon in striking at the Nazi enemies of the Italian people.

When Hitler was forced to the conclusion that his offensive was broken, and he must go on the defensive, he started boasting that he had converted Europe into an impregnable fortress. But he neglected to provide that fortress with a roof. He also left various other vulnerable spots in the wall of the so-called fortress—which we shall point out to him in due time.

The British and American Air Forces have been bombing the roofless fortress with ever-increasing effectiveness. It is now our purpose to establish bases within bombing range of southern and eastern Germany, and to bring devastating war home to these places by day and by night as it has already been brought to western Germany.

When Britain was being subjected to mass bombing in 1940 and 1941—when the British people, including their King and Prime Minister, were proving that Britain "could take it"—the strategists of the Royal Air Force and of our own Army Air Forces were not idle. They were studying the mistakes that Goering and his staff of Nazi terrorists were making. Those were fatal mistakes, as it turned out.

Today, we and the British are not making those mistakes. We are not bombing tenements for the sheer sadistic pleasure of killing, as the Nazis did. We are striking devastating blows at carefully selected, clearly identified strategic objectives—factories, shipyards, munition dumps, transportation facilities, which make it possible for the Nazis to wage war. And we are hitting these military targets and blowing them to bits.

German power can still do us great injury. But that evil power is being destroyed, surely, inexorably, day by day,

and if Hitler does not know it by now, then the last trace of sanity has departed from that distorted mind.

We must remember that in any great air attack the British and Americans lose a fairly high proportion of planes and that these losses must be made up quickly so that the weight of the bombing shall not decrease for a day in the future. In fact, a high rate of increase must be maintained according to plan—and that means constant stepping up of our production here at home.

In the remarkable raid on the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania we lost 53 of our heavy bombers; and more than 500 of our finest men are missing. This may seem like a disastrously high loss, unless you figure it against the damage done to the enemy's war power. I am certain that the German or the Japanese high commands would cheerfully sacrifice tens of thousands of men to do the same amount of damage to us, if they could. Those gallant and brilliant young Americans who raided Ploesti won a smashing victory which, I believe, will contribute materially to the shortening of the war and thus save countless lives.

We shall continue to make such raids all over the territory of Germany and the satellite countries. With Italy in our hands, the distances we have to travel will be far less and the risks proportionately reduced.

We have reliable information that there is definite unrest and a growing desire for peace among the peoples of these satellite countries—Rumania, Hungary, Finland, and Bulgaria. We hope that in these nations the spirit of revolt against Nazi dominance which commenced in Italy will burst into flame and become a consuming fire.

Every American is thrilled by the sledge-hammer blows delivered against the Nazi aggressors by the Russian armies. This summer there has been no successful German advance against the Russians, as in 1941 and 1942. The shoe today is on the other foot—and is pinching very hard. Instead, the Russians have forced the greatest military reversal since Napoleon's retreat in 1812.

The recapture of Kharkov, Stalino, and other strongholds by the Russians, the opening of the Ukraine and the Donets Basin and the freeing of millions of valuable acres and hundreds of inhabited places hearten the whole world as the Russian campaign moves toward the elimination of every German from Russian soil—toward the invasion of Germany itself. It is certain that the campaign in north Africa, the occupation of Sicily, the fighting in Italy and the compelling of large numbers of German planes to go into combat in the skies over Holland, Belgium, and France by reason of our air attacks, have given important help to the Russian armies along their advancing front from Leningrad to the Black Sea. We know, too, that we are contributing to that advance by making Germany keep many divisions in the Balkans, in southern France and along the English Channel. I like to think that these words constitute an understatement.

Similarly, the events in the Mediterranean have a direct bearing upon the war against Japan.

When the American and British expeditionary forces first landed in north Africa last November, some people believed that we were neglecting our obligations to prosecute the war vigorously in the Pacific. Such people continually make the mistake of trying to divide the war into several watertight compartments—the Western European front—the Russian front—the Burma front—the New Guinea and Solomons front, and so forth—as though all of these fronts were separate and unrelated to each other. You even hear talk of the "air war" as opposed to the "land war" or the "sea war."

Actually, we cannot think of this as several wars. It is all one war, and it must be governed by one basic strategy.

The freeing of the Mediterranean, which we started last fall, will lead directly to the resumption of our complete control of the waters of the Eastern Indian Ocean and the Bay of Bengal. Thus, we shall be enabled to strike the Japanese on another of their highly vulnerable flanks.

As long as Italy remained in the war as our enemy—as long as the Italian Fleet remained in being as a threat—a substantial part of British naval strength had to be kept locked up in the Mediterranean. Now that formidable strength is freed to proceed eastward to join in the ever-increasing attack upon the Japanese. It has not been sufficiently emphasized that the freeing of the Mediterranean is a great asset to the war in the Far East.

There has been one serious gap in the lines of our globe-girdling sea power. That is the gap between northwest Australia and Ceylon. That gap can now be closed as a result of victory in the Mediterranean.

We face, in the Orient, a long and difficult fight. We must be prepared for heavy losses in winning that fight. The power of Japan will not collapse until it has been literally pounded into the dust. It would be the utmost folly for us to try to pretend otherwise.

Even so, if the future is tough for us, think what it is for General Tojo and his murderous gang. They may look to the north, to the south, to the east, or to the west. They can see closing in on them, from all directions, the forces of retribution under the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz, and Admiral Lord Mountbatten.

The forces operating against Japan in the various Pacific theaters are just as much interrelated and dependent on each other as are the forces pounding against Germany in Europe.

With the new threats that we offer from the Aleutians, Japan cannot afford to devote as large a proportion of her forces to hold the lines in other areas.

Such actions as the taking of Attu and Kiska do not just happen. They are the results of careful and complete planning which was going on quietly while some of our critics were so perturbed that they

had reached the verge of tears over what they called the threatened invasion of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. It was difficult for them to realize that the carefully prepared and crucial tests in the Coral Sea and at Midway and in the Solomons rendered the Japanese toehold in the Aleutians untenable.

Japan has been hard put to it to maintain her extended lines. She had to withdraw her garrison from Kiska in the face of the oncoming American-Canadian forces because she could not maintain a steady stream of adequate reinforcements and supplies to the Aleutians.

In the Solomon Islands, with heavy fighting, we have gained so many island air bases that the threat to Australia and New Zealand across the Coral Sea has been practically dissipated. In fact, it is safe to say that our position in that area has become a threat on our part against the Japanese in the seas that lie north of the Solomons and north of New Guinea.

American, Australian, New Zealand, and Dutch forces in a magnificent campaign in New Guinea and the Solomons have destroyed much Japanese strength, and have gained for us new bases from which to launch new offensive operations.

After a long period of defensive strategy in Burma, we are determined to take the offensive there. I am also glad to report to you that we are getting more supplies and military help to China. Almost every day word comes that a new air battle has destroyed two and three times more Japanese planes in China and Burma than we ourselves have lost. That process will continue until we are ready to strike right at the heart of Japan itself.

It goes almost without saying that when Japan surrenders, the United Nations will never again let her have authority over the islands which were mandated to her by the League of Nations. Japan obviously is not to be trusted. And the same thing holds good in the case of the vast territories which Japan has stolen from China starting long before this war began.

Since the beginning of our entrance into the war, nearly 2 years ago, the United Nations have continuously reduced enemy strength by a process of attrition. That means, cold-bloodedly, placing the ever-increasing resources of the Allies into deadly competition with the ever-decreasing resources of the Axis. It means the training and use of the allied manpower—which is greater than the Axis. It means the use of our superior facilities and ability to make more munitions, and above all aircraft, more quickly than our enemies can do.

For example, the Allies today on the European front have a definite superiority in almost all weapons of war on any and every point of the encircling line—more guns, more tanks, more planes, more trucks, more transports, more supply ships, and more warships.

In the Pacific, we have taken a steady toll of Japanese war planes and a steady toll of Japanese ships—merchant ships

and naval vessels. The odds are all in our favor—for we grow in strength and they cannot even replace all their losses. It might be called a simple mathematical progression.

However, unless we keep up and increase the tempo of our present rate of production, this greater strength in planes and guns, tanks, and ships can all be lost.

Our great production program started during the darkest days of 1940. With the magnificent contribution made by American industry and American labor, it is approaching full production. Britain has already attained full production. Today, the British Empire and the United States, together, are turning out so much of every essential of war that we have definite superiority over Germany and Japan which is growing with every succeeding minute. But we have no minutes to lose.

Realization of the distances we must cover brings to mind problems that every American should realize—problems of transporting from our shores to the actual fighting areas the weapons and munitions of war which we make. Burma and China can be reached only with extraordinary difficulty. Two years ago, most of the planes we sent had to be knocked down, crated, put on board ship, transported, then uncrated and put together again in India, and from there sent up to the fighting front.

In the case of China, they had to be flown over enormous mountains. Even after they were safely delivered there, the planes had to be kept supplied with ground crews, tools, oil, gasoline, and even spare parts. Since the Japs cut the Burma Road, all these supplies have to be flown over hundreds of miles to bases which had to be built in China.

The same slow process was also the rule in the southwest Pacific.

With the present increased range of airplanes and the establishment of additional bases, we are now flying more of them under their own power than before, but all the things that go to supply them—the gasoline, the tools, the spare parts—still have to be taken by ship to the fighting fronts all over the world. Practically every soldier and all his weapons and equipment have to go by ship. And every time a new forward move develops the whole outfit has to go by ship.

I wonder how many people realize what it means to carry on the war across the Atlantic and the Pacific and through the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, along lines of supply attacked by submarines and dive bombers at many points.

The combined operation of the British and Americans last November against Morocco and Algeria was in point of numbers the largest military movement over the longest number of miles to landings under fire that history has recorded anywhere.

The ships for such an amphibious operation cannot be loaded in the ordinary way, to be unloaded alongside a comfortable, safe wharf. Most of the ships must be "combat loaded" in such a way that the troops go ashore first and

are immediately followed in the proper order by guns and ammunition, tanks, trucks and food, medical equipment and all the supplies of a modern army. Preparations must be made to conduct these landings under enemy fire, and on beaches instead of at docks. People who have seen or planned this kind of operation even over short distances do not speak glibly about landing great expeditions on a few days' notice or on all the beaches of Europe at the same time.

The Members of the Congress have undoubtedly had an opportunity to see at first hand in their own home districts some of our war factories and plants and shipyards throughout the United States which are now working at full blast turning out the greatest amount of war production in the history of the world.

In June and July we were worried by a reduction in the rate of increase in production. Great as our production had been we could not afford to level off. We had to continue the upward curve and not pause on any plateaus.

I am happy to report that the increase was resumed in August. In this month of September it is even better.

For example, during the two months of the recess of the Congress our factories produced approximately 15,000 planes. There was an especially important increase in the production of heavy bombers in August. I cannot reveal the exact figures on this. They would give the enemy needed information—but no comfort. However, the total airplane production is still not good enough. We seek not only to come up to the schedule but to surpass it.

During those same 2 months American shipyards put into commission 3,200,000 tons of large merchant ships—a total of 281 ships, almost 5 ships a day.

Even as the actual fighting engagements in which our troops take part increase in number, it is becoming more and more evident that this is essentially a great war of production. The best way to avoid heavy casualty lists is to provide our troops with the best equipment possible—and plenty of it.

We have come a great way since this Congress first met in January of this year. But I state only a blunt fact when I tell the Congress that we are still a long, long way from ultimate victory in any major feat theater of the war.

First. Despite our substantial victories in the Mediterranean, we face a hard and costly fight up through Italy—and a major job of organizing our positions before we can take advantage of them.

Second. From bases in the British Isles we must be sure that we have assembled the strength to strike not just in one direction but in many directions—by land and sea and in the air—with overwhelming forces and equipment.

Third. Although our Russian Allies have made a magnificent counter offensive, and are driving our common enemies back day by day, the Russian armies still have far to go before they get into Germany itself.

Fourth. The Japanese hold firmly established positions on an enormous front

from the Kuriles through the mandated islands to the Solomons and through the Netherlands East Indies to Malaysia and Burma and China. To break through this defensive ring we must hit them and hit them hard not merely at one point but at many points, and we must keep on hitting them.

In all of history, there has never been a task so tremendous as that which we now face. We can do it—and we will do it—but we must plan and work and fight with every ounce of intelligence and energy and courage that we possess.

The Congress has reconvened at a time when we are in the midst of the Third War Loan drive seeking to raise a sum unparalleled in history—\$15,000,000,000. This is a dramatic example of the scale on which this war still has to be fought, and presents some idea of how difficult and costly the responsible leaders of this Government believe the war will be.

Nothing we can do will be more costly in lives than to adopt the attitude that the war has been won—or nearly won. That would mean a let-down in the great tempo of production which we have reached, and would mean that our men who are now fighting all over the world will not have that overwhelming superiority of power which has dealt so much death and destruction to the enemy and at the same time has saved so many American lives.

That is why I have always maintained that there is no such separate entity as the "home front." Every day lost in turning out an airplane or a ship at home will have its direct effect upon the men now battling up the leg of Italy or in the jungles of the Southwest Pacific or in the clouds over China.

There have been complaints from some sources about the way this production and other domestic activities have been carried on. Some of these complaints of course are justified. On the other hand, some of them come from selfish people who merely do not like to give up some of their pleasures, or a part of their butter or meat or milk.

Fair-minded citizens, however, will realize that although mistakes have been made, the job that has been done in converting peacetime America to a wartime basis has been a great job and a successful one, of which all our people have good reason to be proud.

It would be nothing short of a miracle if this unprecedented job of transforming a peace-loving, unprepared industrial America into a fighting and production machine had been accomplished without some mistakes being made and some people being given cause for complaint.

The Congress is well aware of the magnitude of the undertaking, and of the many gigantic problems involved. For the Congress has been actively involved in helping to work out the solutions to these unprecedented problems.

A few facts will show how vast an enterprise this war has been—and how we are constantly increasing the tempo of our production.

The total amount spent on the war from May 1940 to date is \$128,123,000,000.

The bill is now running at the rate of \$250,000,000 per day.

Up to September 1, 1943, among the more important items produced and delivered since the armament program started in May 1940 are the following:

Airplanes.....	123,000
Airplane engines.....	349,000
Tanks.....	53,000
Artillery weapons.....	93,000
Small arms (rifles, carbines, machine guns, etc.).....	9,500,000
Small-arms ammunition (rounds).....	25,942,000,000
Trucks.....	1,233,000

In most instances more than half of the above total delivered to date was produced during the first 8 months of 1943.

Airplanes.....	52,000
Tanks.....	23,000
Artillery weapons.....	40,600
Small arms (rifles, carbines, machine guns, etc.).....	4,638,000
Small-arms ammunition (rounds).....	13,339,000,000

The number of fighting ships and auxiliaries of all kinds completed since May 1940 is 2,380, and 13,000 landing vessels.

In the 2½ years between January 1, 1941, and July 1, 1943, the power plants built for installation in Navy vessels had a horsepower equal to all the horsepower of all hydroelectric plants in the United States in January 1941.

The completions of Navy ships during the last 6 months were equal to completions in the entire year of 1942.

We have cut down the time required to build submarines by almost 50 percent.

The anti-aircraft and double-purpose guns produced by the Navy since the defense program started in May 1940, if fired all together, would throw 4,600 tons of projectiles per minute against the enemy.

The output of underwater ordnance—torpedoes, mines, and depth charges—during the first half of 1943 was equal to the total production of 1942.

During the month of August 1943 we produced almost as many torpedoes as during all of World War No. 1.

Anyone who has had to build a single factory, tool it up, get the necessary help, set up an assembly line, produce and ship the product will have some idea of what that amount of production has meant.

We have had to raise and equip armed forces approaching 10,000,000 men. Simultaneously, in spite of this drain on our manpower, we have had to find millions more men and millions of women to operate our war factories, arsenals, shipyards, essential civilian industries, and the farms and mines of America.

There have been the problems of increasing greatly the output of our natural resources—not only for our own Army and Navy and for our civilians at home but also for our allies and our own forces all over the world.

Since the outbreak of war in Europe we have increased our output of petroleum by 66 percent. We have stepped up our bituminous coal production by 40 percent, chemicals by 300 percent, iron

ore by 125 percent, hydroelectric power by 79 percent, and steel by 106 percent.

There were the problems of raising and distributing more food than ever before in our history—for our armed services, for our own people, and to help feed our allies.

There was the formidable problem of establishing a rationing system of the necessities of life which would be fair to all of our people.

There was the difficulty of keeping prices from skyrocketing and fighting off the serious specter of inflation.

There was the problem of transporting millions of men and hundreds of millions of tons of weapons and supplies all over our own country and also to all corners of the world. This necessitated the largest railroad and shipping operations in all history.

There were the problems involved in our vast purchases in foreign countries; in our control of foreign funds, located in this country; in our custody of alien property; in our occupation of liberated areas. There were new problems of communications, of censorship, of war information.

There was the problem of maintaining proper management-labor relations; of fair treatment and just compensation to our millions of war workers; of avoiding strikes; of preventing the exploitation of workers or natural resources by those who would seek to become war profiteers and war millionaires.

There were the problems of civilian defense; of lend-lease; of subcontracting war contracts to smaller businesses; of building up stock piles of strategic material whose normal sources have been seized by the enemy—such as rubber and tin.

There was the problem of providing housing for millions of new war workers all over the country.

And touching all of these, there was the great problem of raising the money to pay for all of them.

No sincere, sensible person doubts that in such an unprecedented, breath-taking enterprise errors of honest judgment were bound to creep in, and that occasional disputes among conscientious officials were bound to occur. And if anyone thinks that we, working under our democratic system, have made major mistakes in this war, he should take a look at some of the blunders made by our enemies in the so-called efficient dictatorships.

Even sincere, sensible people sometimes fail to compare the handfuls of errors or disputes, on the one hand, with the billions of instances where the agencies of government in cooperation with each other have moved with the precision of a smoothly working machine.

Some people, when a doughnut is placed before them, claim they can see only the hole in it. Sometimes this is an example of sheer individual pessimism; but sometimes it is caused by motives not consonant with war-winning ideals.

The American people as a whole, however, are fair-minded. They have learned to distinguish between the sen-

sational and the factual. They know that there is no so-called news when things run right. They know, for example, that a few newspapers and columnists and radio commentators can make controversy create news which is eagerly sought by Axis propagandists in their evil work.

Obviously, we never could have produced and shipped as much as we have, we could not now be in the position we now occupy in the Mediterranean, in Italy, or in the southwest Pacific or on the Atlantic convoy routes or in the air over Germany and France, if conditions in Washington and throughout the Nation were as confused and chaotic as some people try to paint them.

We know that in any large private industrial plant doing a thousandth part of what their Government in Washington is doing, there are also occasional mistakes and arguments. But this is not a good comparison. It is like comparing a motorboat with a battleship.

What I have said is not in any way an apology; it is an assertion and a boast that the American people and their Government are doing an amazingly good job in carrying out a vast program which 2 years ago was said to be impossible of fulfillment. Luckily the American people have a sense of proportion—and a memory.

As General Marshall has said in his biennial report:

The development of the powerful Army of today . . . has been dependent upon vast appropriations and the strong support of the Congress, and the cooperation of numerous Government agencies.

I urge all Americans to read General Marshall's fine, soldierly record of the achievements of our Army throughout 2 of the most tremendous years in our history. This is a record which Americans will never forget.

As the war grows tougher and as new problems constantly arise in our domestic economy, changes in methods and changes in legislation may become necessary.

We should move for the greater economic protection of our returning men and women in the armed forces—and for greater educational opportunities for them. And for all our citizens we should provide a further measure of social security in order to protect them against certain continuing hazards of life.

All these things, as well as eventual demobilization, should be studied now and much of the necessary legislation should be enacted. I do not mean that this statement should be regarded in any way as an intimation that we are approaching the end of the war. Such an intimation could not be based either on fact or on reason. But when the war ends we do not want to be caught again without planning or legislation, such as occurred at the end of the last war.

On all these, and on other subjects, I expect to communicate with this Congress from time to time.

In this critical period in the history of our country and of the world we seek cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government to furnish our citizens with the security of the standard of living to

which their resources and their skills in management and labor entitle them in all matters which concern this Nation's welfare, present and future—and the first of such matters, obviously, is the winning of this war.

Finally, as the war progresses, we seek a national cooperation with other nations toward the end that world aggression be ended and that fair international relationships be established on a permanent basis. The policy of the good neighbor has shown such success in the hemisphere of the Americas that its extension to the whole world seems to be the logical next step. In that way we can begin to keep faith with our sons and daughters who are fighting for freedom and justice and security at home and abroad.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 17, 1943.

BARUCH REPORT ON WEST COAST MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at the Wednesday session of the Senate I addressed a public request to Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, for the release of the so-called Baruch report on the west coast manpower situation. I made the demand in the open Senate because the press constantly reported that request for publication of the report, which was originally made on August 19, 1943, had heretofore been denied. Mr. Byrnes immediately wrote me under date of September 15, 1943, releasing the full Baruch report to me and adding a request that I should present it for full publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In view of this prompt and forthright response by Mr. Byrnes—which is entirely in keeping with his character as we knew it when he was one of our greatly respected colleagues—I regret that I did not make my original request directly to him because I would not care to be a party to any presently unfounded implications of suppression. I am very glad now to comply with his request and to present, first, his covering letter to me; second, the full text of the Baruch report on west coast aircraft manpower, which is dated August 19, 1943; and third, the official mimeograph statement issued by the War Mobilization Committee on September 4, which orders the application of some of the Baruch recommendations in the west coast area as of September 15, 1943. I ask unanimous consent that these exhibits be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Without objection, the exhibits may be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits A, B, and C.)

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it seems to me it would be unfair to the report to attempt to summarize it. For the same reason, I hesitate even to speak particularly of any excerpts. I prefer that Senators should read the complete documents, and I assure them that they will find it well worth their while. But I hope I am justified in emphasizing the general trend of the findings and recommendations made by Mr. Baruch in view

of the large confidence which the country rightly has in his ability and his patriotism.

While the Baruch report deals specifically only with a serious manpower shortage in west coast aircraft manufacturing plants, it bears relatively upon the manpower situation as a whole and—as it itself asserts from time to time—offers a key to greater efficiency in the war effort throughout the country.

The Baruch report starts from this premise:

Proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program. Measures undertaken by one agency have been undone by the conflicting actions or inactions of other agencies. In discussions with officials of the War Production Board, War Manpower Commission, and other agencies we have sought to develop a program on which all agencies can agree and take action at once and one which will work.

The Baruch report thereupon proceeds to make its specific recommendations dealing with the attainment of these objectives—an attainment which Director Byrnes correctly says has been substantially embraced in his directive of September 4 respecting the west coast manpower problem. After dealing with the necessity for dependable deferments for all necessary aircraft workers, and the need for the continuing use of high-school boys and girls in the production lines, the Baruch report asserts that the "Demand for labor and supply are hopelessly out of line" and that "a breakdown can be avoided only by the concerted action of all agencies behind a plan that goes to the root of the trouble." Thereupon the report outlines the need for labor priorities and develops in adequate detail a so-called labor budget plan which is aimed to correct this difficulty. This labor budget plan calls for decentralized administration under local auspices and makes this pertinent observation:

The time must end when agencies spend their energies battling to build up empires of power. It is time to reassert the fact that there is one Federal Government—speaking with one voice—not a "centimouth."

The report thereupon lists these further sources of menace to the maintenance of adequate manpower in essential war production:

1. Reduce the alarming turn-over of workers.
2. Enlist every possible source of new labor.
3. Curtail less essential activities.
4. Step up efficiency of labor already in plants.
5. Minimize the disruptive effects of the draft.
6. Combat the hoarding or waste of labor.
7. Improve management.
8. Reduce demands on the labor supply.

The report deals specifically with each of these necessities. It admits that "all through the country, much labor is being hoarded or poorly utilized," and particularly condemns "the prevailing cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts" as encouraging these wastes. I think I should quote the following language:

Under these contracts the Government pays all costs—whatever they are. Since the Government is footing the bill, there is no incentive for manufacturers to economize in the use of materials, facilities, or labor. More workers are hired than are needed. Workers may stand idle—it costs the manufacturers nothing. Much labor is wasted.

The report thereupon constructively discusses the advisability of promptly developing not only "incentive wages" for labor but also "incentive contracts" for producers—and it adroitly suggests means for linking up both types of "incentives" with the post-war era. Meanwhile, it says:

Until now the energies of Government have been directed principally at reducing the 5, 10, or 15 cents of a production dollar that goes into profits. While not relaxing our efforts to prevent profiteering, it is time we turned our attention to reducing the 85, 90, or 95 cents of the production dollar represented by costs.

The report suggests the furloughing of key industrial workers back from the Army into industry. It warns that what it calls premature peace jitters are already threatening an adequate realization of the production job and the military needs still remaining. It condemns too many investigations by congressional committees which overlap each other, although it insistently defends the importance of congressional inquiry. It particularly condemns the utterly enormous paper work required by the Government and costing manpower sadly needed for more productive enterprise.

What I have said is merely a key to the contents of the report. I repeat that the report should be fully read so that it may wholly speak for itself. But I have wanted to say enough to indicate the high importance of the report as it affects the general manpower problem of the country, and I want to express the belief that if its general theme can be translated into general action—as Director Byrnes has already done in certain instances on the west coast through his directive of September 4—we shall greatly simplify our problem and find it much easier to meet.

I wish again to commend Director Byrnes for his prompt and unequivocal response to my request for the publication of the Baruch report and for his swift adoption—at least in one region—of some of its major recommendations. But the report still contains much unmined gold, and it is richly worthy of prompt and intensive study by all concerned in the manpower problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the exhibits requested by Director Byrnes to be fully extended in the RECORD be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., September 15, 1943.
Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VAN: I am advised that in the Senate you demanded that the Baruch report on

the west coast manpower situation be made public immediately.

This report made at my request by Mr. B. M. Baruch and Mr. John Hancock was presented with the statement that it was for my consideration and not for publication. It has been treated like all other interoffice memoranda presented by my associates. However, it is a splendid argument in favor of the action which was taken by the War Mobilization Committee on September 4, which is set forth in the program herewith enclosed.

While ordinarily interoffice memoranda is not made public, I am happy to send this to you with the request that you be kind enough to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD both the report and the program adopted by the committee.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director.

EXHIBIT B

REPORT ON WEST COAST AIRCRAFT MANPOWER AUGUST 19, 1943

As requested by you, Mr. Byrnes, we have been examining the manpower problem in the west coast aircraft manufacturing plants, which was brought to your attention by Under Secretary of War Patterson. Briefly, the facts cited by him were:

"The Boeing plant in Seattle fell behind schedule by 40 Flying Fortresses a month because of insufficient labor. In mid-July the Boeing plant was short 3,000 workers; Los Angeles aircraft plants by 15,000. Although a shortage of engines is now threatened, manpower—not materials—promises to become the principal factor limiting production. Instead of building up their labor forces to the numbers required to meet expanding production schedules, west coast aircraft plants have been barely able to hold their own. If these conditions persist, we will fall short of the present aircraft production program for 1943 at a time when the military need for aircraft is greatest."

Airplane production schedules can—and must be met. The air operations over Europe which are doing such spectacular damage to our enemies are limited today by the supply of planes. When we increase production we increase the bombings over Germany, both the number of raids made and how deeply into Germany those raids can go. We bring the bombing of Tokyo that much closer. We bring the war that much nearer to an end. No other military production program, as far as we can see, will give us such results in so short a time.

Therefore, we have proceeded on the basis that whatever is to be done must be done immediately; that action cannot be delayed in searching for perfection, or until new legislation, such as a National Service Act, can be obtained.

Proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program. Measures undertaken by one agency have been undone by the conflicting actions or inactions of other agencies. In discussions with officials of the War Production Board, War Manpower Commission, and other agencies we have sought to develop a program on which all agencies can agree and take action at once and one which will work.

Nor was there time to make this a study of the entire manpower problem. It is aimed primarily at west coast aircraft difficulties, although some of these recommendations can be applied elsewhere.

DRAFT LOSSES CHECKED

The most pressing need was to halt any further losses of manpower by these plants. Steps were taken promptly to defer all aircraft workers on the west coast until October 1. While meeting the immediate need, this action provided only temporary re-

lief and left much uncertainty in workers' minds as to what will happen after October 1. We recommend that all necessary aircraft workers on the west coast definitely be assured of deferment. These deferments should be extended to subcontractors manufacturing parts for the west coast plants.

This assurance should be given workers immediately so they will know where they stand; it should not be held up until after October 1.

Continuance of these deferments, it should be understood, will depend on the aircraft industry assuming responsibility for seeing that deferments are requested only for absolutely essential workers.

SCHOOLBOY LOSS THREATENED

A second threatened loss is of high-school boys and girls now working in aircraft plants and who are likely to return to classrooms in the fall. In the entire country, we are told, there are 2,000,000 schoolboy war workers alone. They are excellent workers, and their loss would be a serious blow to production.

The War Manpower Commission has been trying to work out plans by which as many as possible of these young workers are retained on a part-time basis. These efforts should be pressed most vigorously. In many communities, school authorities already have worked out such arrangements. In one California aircraft plant, for example, schoolboys work 6 weeks, then go to school 6 weeks. Elsewhere, they will work part of the day or part of the week.

The money earned by these boys will help many obtain a college education that might otherwise be denied them. The feeling of self-reliance that comes from being able to serve their country should make them better citizens when they grow up.

It is urgent that arrangements for keeping these boys on the job be completed before school opens. We recommend that the Governors of these States and the school authorities be requested to meet with the War Manpower Commission to push this program through.

DEMAND EXCEEDS SUPPLY

Draft deferments and part-time shifts for schoolboys will avert the two most immediate threats to the west coast aircraft industry, but they cover only part of the problem.

A simple balance sheet of prospective labor demands and supply tells the story. In the next 6 months, it is estimated, provided all workers now on the Pacific coast remain there, that 500,000 new workers still will be required to meet the needs now foreseen for essential industry and military service. At best, the Manpower Commission estimates about 240,000 additional local workers can be found. This would include 94,000 women now at home, 53,000 youths not now in the labor market, and 40,000 workers employed in less essential industries. Even with the most successful recruiting of new workers, the local labor supply apparently can meet only about one-half of the production demands already scheduled in coming months. And this makes no provision for additional labor demands that are certain to come as we press our offensive in the Pacific.

BREAK-DOWN THREATENED

Demand for labor and supply are hopelessly out of line.

A disastrous break-down of vital production programs all through the Pacific coast region is threatened, not only aircraft but shipbuilding, ship repairs, canning, mining, lumbering, and others. This break-down can be avoided but only by the concerted action of all agencies behind a plan that goes to the root of the trouble.

LABOR PRIORITIES NEEDED

The first and greatest gap in our manpower program is the failure, thus far, to apply any system of priorities to labor. There is one all-important rule of war organization.

When demand exceeds supply, someone—in this case the War Production Board—must decide the order in which things are to be produced. Without such priorities, the distribution of scarce supplies of materials would be chaotic. With these priorities on materials must go priorities for labor so that the limited supply of workers is directed where it should go so that these most essential things do get produced. Such ratings as to the more essential uses of labor are indispensable to any successful manpower program, whether it be voluntary or whether it takes the form of a National Service Act.

Since labor is not like a commodity to be readily shifted or stored, it only means that labor priorities must be administered locally, plant by plant. Each community being different, no national administration is feasible. But priorities for labor there must be.

REGION OVERLOADED

The second root cause of our manpower difficulties has been that production has been planned, new facilities built, and contracts awarded without adequate regard to the supplies of labor available locally. Areas already overloaded have been burdened with additional contracts with the result that tight labor situations have been aggravated.

The west coast's manpower problems cannot be solved by thinking solely in terms of labor controls. Control over production is equally important. The fundamental objective of any sound manpower program must be to bring production demands and labor supply into balance.

LABOR BUDGET PLAN

To accomplish this, we are proposing that a new labor budget plan can be set up in each critical labor community on the west coast, such as Seattle, San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Portland. This labor budget would have two sides to it, as with all budgets. On the one side, employers would draw upon the budget on the basis of priorities, with the War Manpower Commission regulating the flow of labor. On the other side, the War Production Board and other procurement agencies would be responsible for keeping production demands in balance with labor supply. No new contracts would be let in the area unless other production demands were reduced so as to keep the budget in balance.

Detailed procedures on how this budget plan is to operate are being worked out by Mr. McNutt for submission to the various agencies concerned. The basic principles of the plan are—

1. A recognition that the problem is a local one and essentially not one that can be handled on a national basis.
2. On the labor supply side of the budget, a system of priorities rating the comparative labor needs of all employers in each critical labor community.
3. To operate these priorities, in each community a labor priorities committee on which all Government agencies concerned sit.
4. The community, itself, should name the chairman of its priorities committee, a strong citizen who has won public confidence and whom both management and labor trust.
5. On the basis of the priorities laid down, the War Manpower Commission should direct the flow of labor to those plants whose products are most essential and whose labor needs are greatest, and in such a way as to stimulate the use of women workers, curtail the use of labor in activities least essential to the war, and hoarding of labor; make for more effective utilization of labor in plants; and as a guide to draft deferments so that war production is not jeopardized by disruptive drawing of workers into the Army.
6. Employers retain the right to do their own hiring, but they must hire workers from the pool referred to them by the War Manpower Commission on the basis of priorities.
7. Prompt action by the priorities com-

mittee, under the leadership of the community chairman, on all local problems affecting manpower, such as housing, transportation, and the erection of day-care shelters.

8. On the production side of the budget, prompt determination by the War Production Board and other procurement agencies of the priority for war of all products made in these areas.

9. A review of all production programs on the west coast and, where necessary, the shifting of contracts to bring production needs into balance with labor.

10. The curtailment of less essential activities.

11. A constant review of all new contracts involving any increase in employment in the area before they are let, as to whether labor is available. If labor is not, the contract should not be approved unless the procurement agencies can curtail other production demands proportionately so that the labor budget is kept in balance.

DECENTRALIZED ADMINISTRATION

If this labor budget plan is to work, there must be adequate delegation of power from all Washington agencies to their west coast representatives and the communities themselves must get on the team. The job cannot be done from Washington. The best men available must be put in charge in the field. There also must be a clear realization on the part of all agencies of the responsibilities that each must carry out. The right hand controlling labor supply, and the left hand controlling production demands must work together.

The time must end when agencies spend their energies battling to build up empires of power. It is time to reassert the fact that there is one Federal Government—speaking with one voice—not a "centimouth."

WEST COAST COMMITTEE

For handling the production side of the labor budget, it has been suggested that a single production priorities committee be created for the entire west coast, composed of representatives of the Government agencies affected, with the War Production Board man as chairman. This would meet with our full approval. Such a piece of governmental machinery would prove particularly helpful in the future when greater emphasis is placed on fighting in the Pacific and fresh demands will be imposed on the west coast.

COORDINATING THE PROGRAM

The War Manpower Commission should be given the responsibility for coordinating this program and for reporting to you progress in establishing these labor budgets and in keeping the budgets in balance.

LABOR DRAFT THE ALTERNATIVE

This labor budget plan represents more drastic controls than any yet introduced in any community. Manufacturers will have to forego their right to hire as many workers as they please and be contented only with the numbers allotted them according to priority. Workers will be limited in their choice of jobs. No one would suggest such controls in peacetime. But the only alternative to some plan of this sort is a National Service Act for the drafting of labor, which carries with it tremendous implications and would take time to get. Plane production cannot wait.

Without arguing the merits of a National Service Act—which is for Congress to decide—it can be said that everything called for in this labor-budget plan would be necessary in the administration of such an act.

We have always felt that the American people will do voluntarily what is expected of them as long as they know what is wanted

and why—and feel that they are being treated fairly.

The planes lost each month because of insufficient labor are equivalent to the number of planes lost in several days combat. By adopting and enforcing this plan we can offset these battle losses.

IT IS A LOCAL PLAN

The fact that the chairman of the committee, setting local labor priorities, is to be an outstanding citizen of the community should be assurance that the plan will be administered with a full awareness of the needs of the community.

Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the importance of selecting the best man possible in the community to serve as chairman of the local priorities committee and of the necessity for giving him the fullest community support. Able, public-spirited citizens working in their own home towns can do more to relieve its manpower difficulties than anyone else.

The communities, though, must accept their responsibilities and not leave everything to the Federal Government.

The communities also must realize that the extent of adjustment that will be required on the production side of the budget—how much in contracts will have to be shifted out of the region—depends on how effectively the labor priorities work and how intensively every possible source of new labor is mobilized.

While aimed to meet the conditions on the west coast, this labor-budget plan is likely to afford a pattern that can be applied in other communities. However, we feel it wiser to put the plan into effect first in a few of the most critical labor areas and perfect its operations before extending it.

NO SINGLE FORMULA

No single formula—whether it be this plan or a national service act—will solve the manpower difficulties on the Pacific coast or anywhere in the country. In addition, there are needed vigorous and unceasing efforts to:

- Reduce the alarming turn-over of workers.
- Enlist every possible source of new labor.
- Curtail less essential activities.
- Step up the efficiency of labor already in plants.
- Minimize the disruptive effects of the draft.
- Combat the hoarding or waste of labor.
- Improve management.
- Reduce demands on the labor supply.

TURN-OVER IS HIGH

Vigorous actions are needed to overcome the causes of the alarmingly high turn-over of workers. Many of the west coast plants suffer a 100 per cent turn-over a year. In some plants 12 new workers must be hired for each net gain of 1 worker. The turn-over rate for women is higher than for men. With workers streaming through the plants, much labor is lost; efficiency suffers; training is wasted; management problems are aggravated—all of which increases the total labor requirements of these plants. If the rate of turn-over could be reduced, labor needs would be materially eased.

Prompt steps should be taken to improve local housing and transportation conditions; to erect additional day-care shelters for the use of mothers who want to work but have no place to leave their children; to adjust shopping hours, where possible; to correct unsanitary conditions; to relieve the innumerable other annoyances that come with congestion. Price and rent ceilings should be enforced more vigorously. Government alone cannot do the job. Management, labor, and the communities themselves must help. In fact, they must do the bigger part of the job of relieving the difficulties that come with congestion.

COMMUNITY PROGRAM NEEDED

There are entirely too many agencies studying these problems, arguing abstract issues,

and not getting enough done. We suggest that the community itself, through its chairman of the labor priorities committee, take the lead in tackling these problems and that every agency of Government do what this community chairman wants done.

No more studies are needed; what must be done is known. Action alone remains necessary.

WAGE ADJUSTMENTS

Differences in wages between industries often are cited as another cause of turnover. Simply to permit wages to be raised in competitive bidding by industry against industry is no solution. Far from reducing turnover, it probably would make things worse. It would add to the inflationary pressures, already too great for our country's good. However, there will be instances when the effective allocation of manpower cannot be made without some wage adjustments. That is a matter to be determined case by case on the basis of the facts.

We are told that a new classification plan is under consideration at the Boeing plant in Seattle. It would be most helpful if action on this plan is speeded.

COST-PLUS CONTRACTS

Not alone on the west coast but all through the country much labor is being hoarded or poorly utilized. Many workers have written us of the waste of labor in the plants in which they themselves are working. Such wasteful practices are encouraged, among other things, by prevailing cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. Under these contracts the Government pays all costs—whatever they are. Since the Government is footing the bill, there is no incentive for manufacturers to economize in the use of materials, facilities, or labor. More workers are hired than are needed. Workers may stand idle—it costs the manufacturers nothing. Much labor is wasted.

In the early stages of war production when manufacturers were asked to produce things they never made before, there might have been some justification for cost-plus arrangements. By now, Government and industry surely have had sufficient experience in the manufacture of many munitions for fixed prices to be agreed upon.

The various procurement agencies have been considering and experimenting with new types of contracts that would give manufacturers an incentive to reduce costs. These new types of contracts should be substituted for prevailing cost-plus contracts, wherever feasible and as quickly as possible, along the west coast as a starter. Effectively carried through, this change in contracts should save billions of dollars in the prices we are paying for weapons. Through more efficient use of labor, it ought to give us the equivalent of an additional labor force running into the tens of thousands, perhaps, the hundreds of thousands.

Until now the energies of Government have been directed principally at reducing the five, ten, or fifteen cents of a production dollar that goes into profits. While not relaxing our efforts to prevent profiteering, it is time we turned our attention to reducing the 85, 90, or 95 cents of the production dollar represented by costs.

WAGE INCENTIVE PLAN

The Chairman of the Aircraft Production Board, Charles E. Wilson, feels strongly that an incentive wage plan, properly conducted, would contribute to increasing aircraft production. Any plan that will stimulate workers to greater efficiency would be of enormous benefit in the manpower situation. However, it is wise to bear in mind that there is no magic in the term "wage incentive" by itself. To work successfully, an incentive plan must be tailor-made for each specific plant, and must command the enthusiasm of

workers. Many difficulties may limit the idea to no more than a small number of plants. In view of the great potential advantages, we recommend that Mr. Wilson's experience be fully utilized in exploring the possibilities of introducing sound wage incentive plans in the Pacific coast aircraft plants and, where they will command the support of labor and management, be put into effect promptly.

NO GOVERNMENT HOARDING

In any drive against the hoarding and poor utilization of labor, Government-operated plants should set an example. Recently, the War Department ordered a reduction of the number of workers in plants directly under its supervision. All agencies should be asked to review their manpower requirements, plant by plant, and to reduce personnel wherever possible.

PROCUREMENT REVIEW NEEDED

An immediate review of all west coast production programs should be ordered to bring these programs into better balance with prospective labor supply. This should lead to the shifting of some contracts; cancellation of others; more intensive subcontracting in areas where the labor supply is not as critical; and, if desirable, delaying of schedules for some items. The requirements of all items being produced on the west coast should be reexamined in the light of combat experience to see if they are excessive or out of balance. It may develop that certain types of munitions being produced on the west coast are so safely ahead of schedule that we can afford slowing their production to release manpower for stimulating the output of lagging items.

If such a review is to be effective, it cannot be done by the War Production Board alone. The Army, Navy, and other procurement agencies must cooperate wholeheartedly. The services must recognize that, when they impose excessively heavy demands on the west coast for things that can be produced elsewhere, they inevitably delay those programs which can be efficiently produced nowhere else.

MORE SUBCONTRACTING NEARBY

An immediate survey should be made of the possibilities of subcontracting in nearby communities on the west coast.

TIGHTEN FARM DEFERMENTS

Several times in the course of this examination, the belief was expressed that the legislation practically exempting farm labor from the draft may have created something of a haven for draftees on the farms. We could find nowhere sufficient facts available to determine the accuracy or inaccuracy of this charge. The operations of farm deferments should be examined to see whether they have had such effect.

We must have an adequate supply of farm labor to produce as much as possible of essential foods. This has been provided for by the law liberalizing farm deferments. However, it does not serve the Nation's interests to have more labor on the farms than is needed, when labor is so critically short for all activities. The manpower needs of our Nation are so intertwined that to permit excess labor to remain anywhere may force the closing of businesses, the drafting of fathers who would not ordinarily be drafted, more rigid controls for all workers, etc. In particular, the seasonal aspects of agricultural deferment should be examined. Farmers must have the labor they need in peak seasons; but when the season is over these men must become available for other war jobs.

PART-TIME SHIFTS

Every possible local source of additional labor must be tapped and steps taken to facilitate drawing in these new workers. Since the aircraft industry is becoming increas-

ingly dependent upon women, it would be well to consider a part-time shift for women who cannot work a full day. Such a shift would also help in recruiting schoolboys.

FATHER'S DRAFT

The interests of war production demand that from now on deferments be made more on the basis of occupation than family status. The draft already has cut so deeply into the ranks of skilled workers that war production is being hurt. Of the 7,000,000 undrafted fathers of military age, about one-half are believed to be engaged in industries less essential to the war. If these fathers were free from the draft, they would be able to remain untouched in these less-essential industries, contributing nothing to the mobilization of manpower for war.

In a number of instances the armed forces have been compelled to release draftees whose skills could not be replaced. To dip further into the ranks of war workers with irreplaceable skills, while leaving untouched some millions of fathers not engaged in war work, would be to invite serious retarding of war production.

FURLOUGHS MAY BE NEEDED

In the operation of the draft, the aircraft industry has been hit particularly hard in the loss of engineering and supervisory personnel. Some west coast aircraft plants warn that any further drafting of skilled engineering personnel will force a halt in work on developing new airplane designs. The armed forces should be asked to furlough selected keymen, new in the Army, back to the aircraft plants from which they were taken.

Possibly, men who have left aircraft plants can be recruited back to the plants.

CURE LESS ESSENTIALS

Even with every other step taken, it still will be necessary to curtail less essential industries to release workers for more essential war jobs. Otherwise, airplane production schedules on the west coast cannot be met. The decision as to which industries are less essential is a difficult one. It is bound to be resisted. But it must be made.

Curtailling less essential activities has this important advantage: The labor already is in the community and does not have to be brought in from outside with the consequent aggravations of housing and transportation difficulties, food supplies, and other problems.

PEACE JITTERS DANGEROUS

Peace jitters that seem to be spreading around the country give us much concern. Workers are reported feeling that the war is about over, and there is no need for them to stay on their jobs; others are refusing to take jobs in war plants. Manufacturers are distracted from all-out attention to the war by the desire to get back into peace production. Reconversion no longer seems to them a matter of years—but of months. These jitters are being aggravated by needless speculation as to when the war will end, or when reconversion will begin.

As you have said, the surest way to lengthen the war and increase our toll of casualties is to act as if the war were already won. This time we must beat the Germans and Japs so badly that they will never be able to make war on us again. Those Americans who are letting themselves fall victims to peace jitters must realize that they are playing into the enemy's seeking for a negotiated peace. They will make it more difficult for us to stand by our determination upon unconditional surrender.

PRIORITY ON RECONVERSION

Peace speculation is now so widespread that consideration should be given to some measures that will minimize its bad effects. One thought has been that it might be well to

develop, as a matter of public policy, a plan by which priority in reconversion to peace will be given to those plants and workers with the best records in production for war. It might also be helpful for individual companies to develop post-war employment policies which would give preference to those workers who, by their patriotic efforts and continuity on the job, have earned—along with the soldiers—the right to favorable placement after the war. The announcement of such policies now might help reduce turnover. Where companies have dismissal wages, such wages might be adjusted to give larger dismissal guaranties to workers who have stayed on the job. These are only tentative thoughts put forward to stimulate thinking on the problem.

TOO MANY INVESTIGATIONS

Not all of our difficulties with aircraft production are caused by manpower problems. Recently a manpower investigation was made by one congressional group on the Pacific coast. Plant managers and workers were taken from their jobs to answer questions; the newspapers were filled with all sorts of statements, conflicting with established administrative policy. A few weeks later a second congressional group held another series of hearings on manpower problems—also on the west coast—and the same sort of thing was repeated. We are told that still another congressional group is preparing still another manpower investigation.

We would be among the first to insist upon both the right of Congress to investigate and the need for such investigations. But multiplicity of congressional investigations can be as confusing and damaging as duplication and overlapping of authority on the part of the executive branch of the Government. The American people have a right to expect that the number of congressional investigations on the same subject be cut down, and that these investigations be handled so that they do not interfere with the actual management of plants and that they do not hurt war production.

TOO MANY QUESTIONNAIRES

Some west coast aircraft manufacturers complain that more than one-fourth of their time is taken up in answering Government inquiries and questionnaires, and in being interviewed by representatives from different Government agencies. The aircraft companies have expanded so rapidly that their management is spread rather thin—too thin to bear so great a burden of Government curiosity. We recommend that Mr. Wilson, as Chairman of the Aircraft Production Board, take steps to reduce the number of inquiries and interviews to which airplane manufacturers are subjected.

CONFUSION OVER TAX

Another disturbing factor is a misinterpretation by some workers as to how the new withholding tax operates. It has been reported to us that some workers lay off a day to avoid earning wages which will put them in brackets subject to the tax. The Treasury Department should intensify its efforts to make clear to all workers that the withholding of taxes each week makes no difference in the total taxes paid by each worker during the year. How much in taxes a worker must pay depends on his total income during the year. The sums drawn off in withholding are applied as a credit against that yearly tax. If more money is withheld than the tax finally adds up to, the worker gets that money back.

CONTRACT POLICY

Uncertainty in the minds of manufacturers as to the policies the Government will pursue in terminating or canceling war contracts also is likely to distract them from their best production efforts. The various procurement agencies have been working on the formation

of such a policy. If left to themselves, these agencies might develop conflicting policies which would confuse industry. It would seem wiser to have the agencies agree on a uniform policy which can be announced in the near future so that manufacturers will know what to expect.

CONSTANT REVIEW NEEDED

In asking this examination and report we have concerned ourselves only with the problems of the west coast aircraft plants and not the aircraft industry, throughout the country. It may be that some of the things proposed for the west coast should be examined for other parts of the country. This, of course, can be done by the existing agencies. We have touched upon only those things that the Government can do to help solve the aircraft problem. We have not gone into the many things that management itself can do—working in its own plants in daily contact with the workers.

Our study of this problem also emphasizes anew the necessity for your constant review of military and lend-lease requirements, to see that all the different parts of the program are in balance with one another and that the program as a whole is balanced against the essential needs of the civilian economy.

We have reached the stage of our war economy when there is not much to spare. Something gained in one direction must mean a loss in another direction. Consideration of the over-all obligations for food, ships, planes, munitions, etc., raises doubt whether we can carry through all our promises and undertakings unless there is an increase in efficiency, or civilian supplies are reduced, or the program readjusted. We may not be able to get all of everything, but we can get enough of a well-rounded flexible program. By keeping the program under vigilant review, we can make the cuts where they will do the most good.

EXHIBIT C

James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, today made public the west coast manpower program after it had been approved by the War Mobilization Committee.

The program calls for cooperative and direct action by several Government agencies in formulating the plan for dealing with the acute labor shortage problem on the west coast.

In announcing the new program, Justice Byrnes stated that some weeks ago it became apparent a serious labor shortage was developing on the west coast, where a large percentage of ship construction and bomber and fighter plane production is centered.

The program announced today is the outgrowth of a critical study made under the direction of B. M. Baruch and John Hancock for the Office of War Mobilization.

In issuing the west coast manpower program, Justice Byrnes said:

"We have already fallen behind schedule for vitally important war items on the west coast due to manpower shortages. The war work scheduled for the west coast this fall and winter would require 160,000 persons in shipbuilding and ship repairs and 100,000 more in aircraft construction.

"It is obvious that drastic measures are required to increase the available labor supply on the west coast and to insure the most efficient and economical use of the available labor supply.

"It is also obvious that the production program schedules for both war materials and civilian supplies must be carefully reexamined to make certain that the production most urgently needed is not held back by efforts to meet production less urgently needed and that, whenever feasible, work that can be done elsewhere is shifted to areas where labor shortages are less acute.

"Manpower and production cannot be dealt with separately for they are inseparable parts of a single but complicated problem. The west coast war manpower program calls for the closest cooperation between the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, and the various procurement agencies on a national, a regional, and an area basis. The program is based to a large extent on a plan developed in the Buffalo, N. Y., area which, within a smaller field of operation, has worked with success. If it is equally successful in the west coast area, it will be extended to other areas.

"The program adopted is not a program to investigate and report. It is a program which provides for the setting up of operating machinery for the flexible and continuing adjustment of manpower and production in accordance with the changing needs of our strategy.

"If when all available labor is exhausted there is still a shortage and after review of contracts it becomes apparent that the war effort would best be served by canceling certain war contracts in an acute labor shortage area and placing these contracts in another area where more labor is available, such action will be taken. However, the greatest care will be exercised not to disrupt existing production and no essential contracts will be canceled and production shifted elsewhere until after thorough study and investigation it is determined that labor is not available in the area involved."

An outline of the program follows:

WEST COAST WAR MANPOWER PROGRAM

The critical production situation on the west coast requires that effective action be taken immediately to restore and maintain the essential balance between production demand and manpower supply. The program outlined below is designed to accomplish this purpose. It involves an accurate determination of the total manpower available and of the volume of production, including transportation and other essential services, which can be maintained when production schedules and manpower resources have been brought into balance.

I. Direction and over-all coordination

The War Manpower Commission will be assigned the responsibility for directing and coordinating those phases of the west-coast manpower program concerned with the supply and distribution of labor.

II. Determination of production urgencies and manpower priorities

A. The War Production Board is made responsible for directing and coordinating those phases of the west-coast manpower program concerned with the adjustment of production programs to meet the available labor supply, as reported and developed by the War Manpower Commission. The War Production Board will exercise its control in the adjustment of the military programs through the Chairman of the Production Executive Committee of the War Production Board. The War Manpower Commission will appoint a representative on Production Executive Committee. The Production Executive Committee will take prompt action to adjust production schedules so as to effect and maintain a balance between the manpower requirements and supply, and will submit a monthly report of progress to the Office of War Mobilization.

B. Area Production Urgency Committees:

1. There shall be established for such west-coast areas as may be deemed necessary by the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission an Area Production Urgency Committee, composed of one responsible representative of each of the following: War Production Board (chairman), War Manpower Commission, War Department, Navy Department, Maritime Commission, War Food Administration, Aircraft Resources

Control Office, Office of Defense Transportation (when transportation problems are involved), and such other agencies as the committee may from time to time invite to assist it.

Where adjustments in the military programs become necessary, due to shortage of labor, after full effort to increase the available supply either the full committee or a subcommittee composed of those members representing the military programs and War Manpower Commission under the chairmanship of the representative of the War Production Board, will submit their recommendations with respect to such adjustments to the chairman of the Production Executive Committee of the War Production Board for action.

2. The chairman of each Area Production Urgency Committee, who shall be appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board, shall, subject to the provisions enumerated in paragraph II B 1, after advice and consultation with the committee, perform the following functions:

(a) Determine the production programs which are feasible in the area and their relative urgency in accordance with standards established by War Production Board under its authority over procurement policies.

(b) Inform the War Manpower Commission of approved production schedules or production requirements of establishments or categories of establishments in the area.

(c) Review proposals for facilities and for major supply contracts in the area, as provided in section III A, and make appropriate recommendations to the War Production Board in the light of the prospective availability of manpower.

(d) In accordance with policies of the War Production Board develop a program for balancing labor supply and requirements by redistributing production from one area to another when maximum manpower supplies and minimum requirements necessitate such redistribution.

(e) Recommend to the War Production Board the need for adjustment of civilian production, as provided in section III C.

C. Manpower priorities:

1. On basis of urgencies of production and essential services as determined by the Production Urgency Committee manpower priorities and allocations will be determined by area manpower priorities committees, composed of one responsible representative of each of the following: War Manpower Commission, Selective Service System, War Production Board, War Department, Office of Defense Transportation (when transportation problems are involved), Navy Department, Maritime Commission, War Food Administration, Committee for Congested Production Areas, and such other agencies as the committee may from time to time invite to assist it.

When the same agency is represented on both the Production Urgency Committee and the Manpower Priority Committee the same representative should be designated for both committees.

Each area War Manpower Commission Management Labor Committee shall be requested to recommend the chairman of the Area Manpower Priority Committee, who shall be, preferably, an outstanding citizen not affiliated with any of the above agencies nor identified with a dominant group interest, or, if such a person is not available, a member of the staff of the War Manpower Commission. The chairman shall be appointed by the War Manpower Commission.

2. It shall be the responsibility of the Area Manpower Priorities Committee to make recommendations to the Area Manpower Director in manpower priorities and allocations as follows:

(a) On the basis of urgencies of production and essential services as determined by

the Production Urgency Committee, list establishments, services, or categories of establishments and services within the area according to their urgency and their need for labor; fix employment ceilings for individual plants, services or activities, and advise the Area Director, War Manpower Commission, thereof.

(b) List significant establishments, services or activities in the area in three classes:

(1) Class I: those which may expand their employment to the established ceilings.

(2) Class II: those which may maintain employment at an established ceiling through continued hiring as necessary.

(3) Class III: those which may not hire (except in emergencies) and from which workers will be drawn by issuing releases and by direct recruitment by the War Manpower Commission.

(c) Advise the Area Director of the War Manpower Commission on all questions of priority listings and ceilings established for individual plants or services.

(d) Advise the Area Production Urgency Committee concerning production of essential plants or activities within the area which might be redistributed to other areas.

(e) Advise and recommend to the Area Director of the War Manpower Commission civilian services within the area which might be adjusted, to the extent required to maintain the manpower budget, consistent with the maintenance of essential community services.

D. The War Manpower Commission will establish standards for the Manpower Priorities Committees to be used in translating production urgencies into manpower priorities.

E. The War Manpower Commission will integrate the work of the Area Manpower Priority Committees with its established appeal procedure—and the existing management-labor committee organization.

III. Balancing Production and Manpower Requirements

A. Future expansions requiring manpower on the west coast will be avoided insofar as possible:

1. The area production urgency committees will review all proposals for new facilities and all supply contracts involving increases in employment, with accompanying proposals from the procurement agency for the reduction of other contracts to provide the necessary manpower, and will submit their recommendations thereon to the War Production Board.

2. The area production urgency committees will cooperate with the War Manpower Commission to the end that labor released in the area will be utilized promptly and effectively.

B. Where it will be advantageous to the war program, war production will be removed from the west coast by the curtailment and redistribution of production and by forcing subcontracting, with due regard for differences in efficiency of production.

1. Whenever there is a reduction in overall production requirements for any item produced on the west coast, consideration should be given to withdrawing production from the west coast.

2. Whenever there is capacity (and available labor) to meet the production requirements of a given program elsewhere, production commitments on the west coast should be adjusted as quickly as possible and redirected to other regions.

3. Procurement agencies will use every means at their disposal to encourage contractors to subcontract as much as possible of their work to producers outside the west coast region.

C. On the basis of recommendations by the area production urgency committees, the War Production Board will exercise its authority over priorities and the allocation of

materials to adjust civilian production and services, insofar as such action will make needed labor available to essential war production.

1. The area production urgency committees will recommend where and to what extent curtailment of less essential production in areas or industries is to be effected.

2. The chairman of the War Production Board will instruct the appropriate industry divisions of the War Production Board and the Smaller War Plants Corporation to be guided by these recommendations in granting assistance and allocating materials.

D. The War Manpower Commission will take concurrent action to place in high priority employment, workers released through curtailment and redistribution of production.

IV. Mobilization and Stabilization of the Labor Force

A. The War Manpower Commission will institute manpower priorities for all non-agricultural employment as follows:

1. All establishments and services entitled to hire workers shall select only workers from among those referred by the United States Employment Service or through other approved channels according to standards and conditions prescribed by the War Manpower Commission (as provided in II C). Workers will select employment only from among those jobs to which they have been referred in accordance with the provisions of this section.

2. The standards and conditions for the referral of workers through approved channels other than the United States Employment Service must include provision for the referral of workers in order of established manpower priority listing and relative urgency of manpower need.

B. In respect to agricultural employment, the following steps will be taken:

1. The War Food Administration will determine the labor requirements for essential agriculture, by crop and by area, based on production and manpower requirements.

2. The War Food Administration will institute a system for periodic reporting of employment and labor requirements to the area manpower priorities committees.

3. The War Food Administration will distribute agricultural labor throughout the west coast according to manpower needs established in accordance with B-1 above and consistent with agreements entered into with foreign countries.

4. The War Manpower Commission will aid the War Food Administration in obtaining manpower for peak seasonal requirements, including, where necessary, release of non-agricultural workers for farm work, importation of foreign workers, and allocation of prisoners of war, and, in emergencies, United States Army units.

5. The War Food Administrator, working in conjunction with the Selective Service, will, from time to time, review all class II-C and class III-C deferments to give assurance that such deferrees are actually engaged in essential agricultural employment.

C. Selective Service withdrawals from rated establishments will be related to employment ceilings and replacement possibilities with adequate consideration for the deferment of key workers.

1. Replacement summaries will be required of all establishments with class I and class II ceilings.

2. To avoid reduction of employment materially below the established ceilings, the Selective Service System will accept replacement schedules for the regulation of withdrawals in high-priority establishments.

3. Registrants in critical occupations will receive full consideration for deferment if they are working in high priority establishments. Registrants qualified in critical occupations who are not working in high priority establishments will be referred to the

United States Employment Service for placement when their cases come before the Selective Service System for classification or reclassification; and such registrants will be considered for deferment if they accept jobs at their highest skills in high priority establishments.

D. The War Manpower Commission will utilize all of its own facilities and obtain the cooperation of all other agencies in impressing upon the workers the important role which they play in the total war program. The objective will be through improved worker morale to influence each worker to find the right job and to remain in the employment where he is needed.

V. Manpower utilization

A. The War Manpower Commission will expand and intensify its manpower utilization programs. At the request of management of any establishment or the War Production Board, it will undertake in the order of urgency of need to assist management to reduce labor hoarding and under-utilization of skills, to improve training, supervision, and personnel management, to eliminate causes of turn-over and absenteeism, and to minimize labor requirements of listed plants. In carrying out this program the War Manpower Commission will coordinate the manpower utilization activities of other agencies and will make full use of their facilities and resources. Relationships between the W. P. B. and the W. M. C. relative to manpower utilization shall be governed by the agreement of September 1943 between the two agencies.

1. In determining employment ceilings, Area Manpower Priorities Committees will take into account the effectiveness of labor utilization and the possibilities of meeting additional production requirements in whole or in part by more effective utilization of labor.

2. In effecting manpower economies, plant management will have the help of Manpower Utilization Consultants of the War Manpower Commission who will be advised and assisted by procurement and other agencies of Government in the conduct of utilization surveys of major plants. Such surveys will result in recommended measures for:

(a) Improving utilization of skills through job analysis, transfer, upgrading, and labor productivity procedures.

(b) Improving personnel policies, practices, and supervision, and worker morale.

(c) Eliminating in-plant causes for turn-over, absenteeism, and labor hoarding.

3. The War Production Board and the appropriate procurement agencies will use their authority in support of such surveys, and will implement the execution of approved recommendations.

VI. Manpower recruitment

A. The War Manpower Commission, in collaboration with the Office of War Information, will use to the maximum every device and medium available to intensify the recruitment of additional workers from within the area. This will include the use of the press, radio, and all other means of public information, to encourage and facilitate:

1. Transfer of workers from less urgent work, by direct recruitment and by exercise of authority to require releases.

2. Recruitment of women and other groups not now employed in essential work.

3. Use of part-time workers, including boys and girls in cooperation with schools.

4. When necessary and under appropriate standards facilitate the

(a) Importation of foreign labor.

(b) Use of prisoners of war.

(c) Use of troops.

B. To avoid the unnecessary reduction of essential work contracted for the west coast, if improved production per worker, and the recruitment of additional workers locally do

not close the gap in need for workers, the War Manpower Commission will recruit additional workers from outside the area in accordance with established War Manpower Commission standards and procedures. This will require a Nation-wide and intensive informational and recruitment campaign. It may also demand the establishment of manpower priorities for workers between other sections of the country and the west coast.

VII. Community and living conditions

A. The War Manpower Commission and the Office of War Information will conduct informational campaigns to impress on the west coast communities the seriousness of the manpower situation, the threat to war production and the war effort, and the need for individual cooperation and community support in the program.

B. The Committee for Congested Production Areas in the Executive Office of the President will coordinate the activities of the Federal agencies, stimulate necessary action by State and local governments, and will otherwise utilize their authority by prescribing such policies and actions as may be necessary to effect the coordination of Federal agency actions relating to facilities and services.

VIII. Effective date

The effective date of this program is September 15, 1943.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the Senator from Michigan include in his request for publication in the RECORD the release of September 4 by Mr. Byrnes?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to comment on the report by Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hancock to Mr. Byrnes, which is the subject of the present animadversions. I believe it ought to be stated, however, that my information is that there was never anything in the report which Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Baruch, or, so far as I know, anybody else, desired to keep from the public. The report was made to Mr. Byrnes at his request by Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hancock. They made a survey of the situation which Mr. Byrnes had in mind, and then made a report to him as has now been indicated. That report, of course, as many reports which Mr. Byrnes has called for, and must call for, involves a discussion of certain agencies and departments, and the adoption of the program which may be suggested. That was particularly true in this case. So it was necessary for Mr. Byrnes as the Director of War Mobilization, to call into conference the representatives of some of the agencies, including the War Manpower Commission. He called into conference Mr. McNutt, head of the War Manpower Commission, who later submitted a plan substantially to put into effect the recommendations made in the Baruch report. He also called in representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, which are likewise involved in recommendations and suggestions contained in the report.

Manifestly, it is the obligation of the Office of War Mobilization and of Mr. Byrnes, as its directing head, to reconcile, if possible, any controversies which may exist among departments and agencies before such controversies reach

the press or the public. We all know what has happened in the past with regard to some controversies prematurely reaching the public press when there was a chance to iron them out and adjust them and give to the country united action on any particular problem. So it was necessary for Mr. Byrnes to pursue that course in regard to the Baruch report.

I am sure that I am within the truth—I have been so assured by Mr. Byrnes—when I state that, subject to the requirement on his part to consult with and harmonize the agencies involved in the report, which agencies had to take action, there never at any time was any question of the desirability of making the report public.

I am glad that it is now possible for the report to be made public, and I am glad to cooperate with the Senator from Michigan in that regard.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator's attention was diverted when I started to present the report. I think he will find that I have said on my own account just as conclusively as he has said it that there should be no implication whatever of criticism of Mr. Byrnes for any heretofore suggested suppression of the report.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's reiteration of that point; but I think it should also be said that in the performance of his duty in a sort of over-all overseeing capacity it is perfectly obvious that Justice Byrnes has called for reports and information, and will in the future call for reports and information, which cannot immediately be given to the public because they involve interdepartmental and interagency relations which it is a part of his duty to harmonize and put into effect. No doubt there will be other instances in which he will ask for reports from those in responsible positions; and it may not be advisable, until the reports and their recommendations are threshed out by all the agencies involved, to give publicity to the textual content of the report itself. I think there can be no misunderstanding among us here or between us and the executive departments as to the propriety of the action in such cases.

Referring further to the Baruch report, I think it ought to be stated—and I am sure the Senator from Michigan will agree—that as a result of the action taken following that report and in the directive issued on September 4 all the agencies of Government involved or who have any duty to perform in regard to the recommendations of that report are on the west coast cooperating in undertaking to carry out the recommendations of Mr. Baruch.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree to that, but I would not want it overlooked that Mr. Baruch has also included a number of highly fundamental recommendations covering the situation as a whole, as exemplified, for example, by his statement that the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts are desperately injurious to the national economy. I would not want it overlooked that there is still infinitely

much in the report which requires great study and far wider application.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but the Senator will agree that it is more difficult to cover the broader field, as it has been attempted to cover the specific field on the Pacific coast with regard to the sources of labor supply.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator.

SUBSCRIPTION OF GRAVES COUNTY, KY., TO THIRD WAR LOAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while I am on my feet let me say that some weeks ago in the little village of Fancy Farm, Ky., which is in Graves County, about 3 miles from where I was born, I made a brief talk on the approaching War bond campaign. I was optimistic enough to predict that that county would not only meet its quota in the bond drive now in progress but that it would exceed its quota, and I complimented the county upon the fact that in all the drives thus far it had exceeded its quota. I have before me a telegram from Mr. Jess G. Anderson, editor of the Mayfield Messenger, referring to my comment on that occasion. I ask that the telegram now be read by the clerk and put into the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read the telegram.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

MAYFIELD, Ky., September 17, 1943.

Senator ALBAN W. BARKLEY,

United States Senate:

I have the honor to inform you that Graves County has already oversubscribed its Third War Loan quota of \$637,000 and may double that figure by the end of the campaign. You said at Fancy Farm that you would tell about Graves on the Senate floor. We have not announced we are over the top. If you would care to you may. Population, 30,000. Graves has never fallen shy of any quota of bonds, etc.

JESS G. ANDERSON,
Editor, Mayfield Messenger.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, as amended, on page 2, line 13, after the words "United States", it is proposed to strike out "unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation by a grand jury, congressional committee, or other public body, or before a United States commissioner, or other proceeding instituted or conducted by it, and."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I want to invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the pending bill, which is of great importance and deals with

a law which has been on the statute books of this country since 1863. The Senate at this time is asked to consider a change in that law, which is known as the Informer's Act. It is of particular importance at this time when so many great war contracts have been made and are in process of performance. In substance, the act, as it exists today, provides that if anyone discovers or has knowledge of a fraud committed upon the Government he may institute a suit in the Federal court for the recovery of the money of which the Government has been defrauded.

The Department of Justice came before the Judiciary Committee and wanted that law repealed. A majority of the committee decided not to repeal the law, but has reported to the Senate a bill which, in substance, provides that before any individual may bring such a suit upon information of fraud in the case of a Government contract he must submit to the Attorney General of the United States the information upon which he would act, and the Attorney General may then institute the suit or may refuse to do so. If, in his wisdom, he does not think the suit should be brought or if 6 months elapse after notice has been given by the informer without suit being brought by the Attorney General, then the informer may bring suit. That, in substance, is the measure as reported to the Senate after being changed by the Judiciary Committee.

I have offered an amendment which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate. I ask that there be stricken from the bill, as reported by the Judiciary Committee, the following words:

unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation by a grand jury, congressional committee, or other public body, or before a United States commissioner, or other proceeding instituted or conducted by it.

The offering of this amendment presents this situation, Mr. President: If this bill shall be passed as reported by the Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General after receiving the report of information may decline to bring suit, but a citizen who himself does not have original information but may obtain such information from some other source cannot bring suit even after the Attorney General has refused or declined to bring it. On the other hand, if the amendment which I have submitted shall be adopted by the Senate, the informer or the person who has knowledge must go to the Attorney General and ask him to bring the suit, and the Attorney General has 6 months in which he may bring suit to recover for the fraud. Then if the Attorney General should decline to bring suit under this amendment any citizen could bring suit on behalf of himself and the United States Government, regardless of whence he may have obtained the information.

I think that that ought to be the law. If this bill remains intact as written, and is passed by this body in its pres-

ent form, the court is deprived of jurisdiction to hear a suit or to pass upon or entertain a suit brought by one who has to get his knowledge from some other source than his own knowledge. In other words, unless this amendment be adopted, the information upon which such a suit must be brought must originally initiate with the plaintiff. I read the language of the bill as written:

upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person.

If that language be left in the bill, Mr. President, it absolutely destroys the whole force of the informer's act.

I am not speaking on behalf of anyone who wants to bring a suit; I am not interested in that. I recognize that there may have been abuse under the present statute, but chance for further abuse is certainly eradicated when we give the Attorney General 6 months to bring suit before any individual may institute such an action, as is now proposed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I understand correctly that the language provides that a suit cannot be brought by a private citizen unless the information—the facts—are original with him?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the exact language.

Mr. MURRAY. If someone else had discovered the facts ahead of him, even though the other person was not going to use the facts on which to base a suit, nevertheless, he, not having original knowledge, would be prohibited from bringing a suit?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is my understanding of the language of the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Obviously, the purpose of the amendment is to prevent suit being brought by a private citizen where the Department of Justice fails to act or refuses to act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MURRAY. It is legislation in the interest of protecting those people who design to defraud and cheat the Government of the United States?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The original statute is aimed at bringing to punishment those who commit frauds upon the Government and to recover money that has been obtained by fraud from the United States Government under contracts between the Government and private citizens.

Mr. MURRAY. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY. What will be the situation if the bill is passed as it is now written with reference to compensation of the individual who brings suit if he does bring a suit upon original information?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the original act the Government received 50 percent of the recovery and the individual who undertook the suit and paid the expenses of it received 50 percent.

I should like at this time to make an inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MURRAY. My understanding is that the provision to which the Senator has just referred is now proposed to be stricken out and that no compensation whatever will be allowed the private citizen who brings such a suit, nothing will be allowed to compensate him for the efforts he makes in discovering the evidence and prosecuting the case.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; up to a maximum of 10 percent may be allowed by the court, when the Government brings the suit upon information.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Attorney General brings the suit, and the suit is based upon information furnished by a private citizen, the court is entitled, in such a case, to allow a part of the recovery by way of compensation to the individual who furnishes the evidence?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Up to a maximum of 10 percent.

Mr. MURRAY. Up to a maximum of 10 percent, but no provision whatever is made for the private citizen who brings suit on his own motion after a failure of the Attorney General to sue.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield for an answer to the question just asked.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator from Montana is entirely wrong in his assumption. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] offered an amendment on that subject, which he can explain better than I can.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield for an answer to the question propounded.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill now provides that in case the Attorney General shall be notified and evidence shall be given to him and he fails to bring suit within 6 months, or prior to the end of the 6 months' period he notifies the party furnishing the evidence that he will not bring suit, the party then bringing the suit would get one-half of the penalty, which is, under the statute, \$2,000, and one-half of the damages, which in such a case are double damages, as provided in the statute.

Mr. MURRAY. In other words, the original law is not changed in that respect?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not changed at all in that respect.

Mr. MURRAY. So that the original act provides for a double penalty, and provides that 50 percent of the recovery shall go to the person bringing the suit, in case of the failure of the Attorney General to bring suit?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. That part of the original act is not changed?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct; it remains just as it is.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Then, I say to the junior Senator from Michigan, his interpretation is entirely different from that of the chairman of the committee, and I can refer to his explanation, which is just the opposite. I call the Senator's attention to page 5871 of the Record for June 15. In reporting the bill, the distinguished Senator from Indiana made the following statement:

The only difference in the remedy is that under the old statute the informer received half the recovery. Under the amendment he will receive such compensation as the court may deem to be fair and reasonable, provided it does not exceed 10 percent of the recovery.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If the Senator from North Dakota, who was present every moment of the time while I was addressing the Senate, will read the context, he will find that I was talking about an entirely different proposition than the one raised by the Senator from Montana. If the provisions written into the new bill, by amendment, are carried out, the informer may then receive not more than 10 percent compensation for his services in furnishing the original information.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield further?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The statute is not changed with respect to the recovery by the informer. When the informer brings his suit, he still gets his 50 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. That is not in this proposed amendment of the statute.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is in the original act, and therefore it is not covered by the proposed amendment. That is the original act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to have that question put at rest.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. For what purpose?

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia a question, if I may.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to page 2, line 14, and ask him if every proper purpose for which he argues so cogently could not be accomplished if he were to limit his amendment merely to striking out the words "original with such person and"? The provide would then read:

Provided, That no district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources not in the possession of or obtained by the United States.

And so on.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not think that would meet the situation, because it is my position that after the Attorney General has had an opportunity to institute a suit and has not done so, any citizen of this country, regardless of the source from which he may get his information, whether from a Government investigation, whether someone else may tell him, whether from some other trial, some other judicial proceeding, such person should have a right to bring a suit in the name of the United States. The whole matter is aimed at stopping fraud, and recovering money obtained by fraud.

I do not think that the citizen who undertakes to do that should be limited to information originally obtained, by him, or to information other than that in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it. In other words, if such a man obtains information through any proceeding conducted by the United States, or any inquiry, and the United States Government declines to prosecute the suit, I think the citizen should have a right to prosecute it. That is my position, and that is why I do not think the able Senator's suggestion meets the question raised here.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Merely for the observation, and to preserve the continuity of our colloquy, down through the whole history of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence suits in the names of private individuals in behalf of the Crown and in behalf of the sovereign were brought under circumstances such as those referred to by the Senator from West Virginia; but experience taught, and it seems to have been the better judgment of mankind, that private suits in the name of the Crown or in the name of the sovereign, generally, should be limited. Consequently, through the proposed remedial legislation reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, we have now sought to relegate to the past an archaic practice, and have sought rather to limit this type of action to the designated authorities, who are the creatures of the Government, who are appointees of the Executive, and who are sworn to do their duty.

With those observations, I would at another time discuss further the contentions of the Senator from West Virginia; and let me say that I have very great respect for his position, and know that he is perfectly sincere in urging the suggestions he submits to this body. That was his attitude in the committee, and I know that there everyone had great respect for his opinions and observations. Under our system of procedure here, however, when we do not agree, we raise the issue, and sooner or later we vote and decide it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Connecticut, who always makes an able contribution to any discussion in which he engages.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan in a moment. I wish to say, however, that while

we must have full trust in the appointed officers of Government, it is now proposed that we change a very old statute, and that we pass a statute which shall be applicable for all time, or until changed again. The greatest check upon the proper conduct and action of a public official lies in action taken by the people themselves. If some Government official should fail to do his duty with respect to a fraud against the Government, then that fraud would continue unchecked, unchanged, uncorrected, unpunished, if the bill shall be passed in its present form. I ask the adoption of my amendment deleting this restrictive language, so that any citizen of this land, after the Government shall have failed to prosecute, may come forward and prosecute the case in the name of the Government. My amendment will provide a safeguard. My amendment will not hurt the public official if he performs his duty. It provides a safeguard against failure in public duty which I feel should be provided by Congress.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have a question I should like to submit. Suppose we amend the language which the Senator from West Virginia asks to strike out, which I believe should be amended for the purpose of clarity as follows: After the word "evidence", in line 14, on page 2, change the word "and" to "or"; after the word "not" in line 15, add the word "then"; after the words "possession of", in line 15, insert the words "the United States", and after the words "or obtained", insert the words "from such person", so the language would then read:

By any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, or sources original with such person and not then in the possession of the United States or obtained from such person.

I have in mind that that change in language would enable a person with the evidence to go before a congressional committee or a grand jury and give his evidence freely, and have the United States Government obtain it in that way, and would then be able to bring his suit as provided for in the act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I may say to the able Senator from Michigan that the suggestion made by him does not meet the point, because my position is that no restriction whatsoever should be placed upon any citizen to bring suit after he shall have informed the Attorney General, and given the Attorney General 6 months within which to proceed. It seems to me that any citizen should have the right to proceed against the wrongdoer, without restriction as to where he may obtain the information and facts upon which he proceeds.

I think such a provision as I propose would create a desirable safeguard against failure on the part of the Department of Justice and its agents to perform their duties. When frauds occur—and already instances have been cited in which such frauds have oc-

curred—under the immense war contracts, it is proposed to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the Department and its agents. What harm can be done by saying to the Department of Justice, "If you do not perform your duty some citizen of this country is going to rise and perform it for you"? I think such provision should be made. I am not saying that the Department will not perform its duty, but if the Department is going to perform it, why be afraid of this requirement, this measure of force, so to speak, that will require it to perform its duty?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I am in accord with the Senator from West Virginia. I think he has stated the situation very clearly. It seems to me there is no necessity for all the legal phraseology and verbiage which is contained in the bill. The original act with a few simple amendments should be allowed to stand exactly as it is, for the purpose of protecting the Government of the United States from frauds which are being perpetrated during the present war.

The act should be allowed to stand precisely as it is, except that it should be amended so as to prevent suits from being brought by private individuals until the Department of Justice is given an opportunity to act or decline to act. When the Department acts, of course the private individual would be foreclosed. The right of the individual to sue upon default of the Attorney General is an insurance against fraud. All that is necessary in the present situation is merely to provide that no suit can be brought by an individual until 60 days after the Attorney General shall have had notice and an opportunity to study the case and determine whether or not suit should be brought. Then of course if the Attorney General refuses to act, the private citizen should be free to base his suit either on original evidence or on evidence which he may secure from a grand jury or from any other source—from the Department of Justice or even from the local county courts.

It seems to me the purpose of the proposed legislation should be to protect the Government and the people of the United States from the serious and widespread frauds being perpetrated nearly every day. On my desk this morning I found a clipping dated yesterday which sets forth a description of a new suit brought against a large national concern for cheating the Government in respect to the manufacture and sale of aluminum castings essential for the war. Some of the frauds we read about are perpetrated in such manner as even to endanger the lives of the boys at the front. It seems to me there should be no question but that every opportunity should be given to any American citizen, where he sees fraud being committed, to bring it to the attention of the Attorney General, and if the Attorney General fails to sue, the citizen himself should be entitled to bring suit. Half the time it is impossible for the

Attorney General's office to devote the study and care necessary in developing the proof in some of these cases, especially cases of fraud in connection with bidding, when persons have submitted bids and are entitled to an examination and consideration of their bids, yet are shut out by reason of influence or pressure, and fraud has thus been perpetrated upon the Government by reason of which the Government has been compelled to pay immense sums of money for materials which the original bidders could have supplied at lower figures. In all such cases the individual should have the right to sue if the Attorney General fails to act. Individuals should be given the opportunity in such cases to call the matter to the attention of the Attorney General, and if he fails to act, they should be entitled to act on their own accord. It seems to me the bill should be amended simply in that respect, and in no other respect.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel I have made my position clear on this subject. I believe the situation is understood, particularly in view of the very clear explanation and statement made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I submit to the Senate that my amendment creates a safeguard because it first gives the Government the right to bring the suit, and, in fact, the citizen cannot bring it, and the court cannot even take jurisdiction of it, until the information has first been given to the Attorney General, and he has had 6 months within which to act to bring suit. If the Government sees fit not to bring suit within that time, the individual should be permitted to bring suit, and should not be foreclosed on the question whence his information comes. Are we to say that because the information is revealed by a congressional investigation, or because some Government agency discloses the fraud, if the Attorney General chooses not to bring the suit, a citizen cannot bring it? I do not see the reason for taking such a position. I do not see why such protection should be thrown around any Government official. His judgment, though made in the utmost of good faith, may have been wrong in not bringing a suit, but I feel that if the citizen knows of a fraud, or if he learns of a fraud from sources not original with him, and submits the matter to the Attorney General, thus giving him an opportunity to bring suit, and the Attorney General refuses or fails to do so, then, regardless of whence the information comes, for the protection of this country, the citizens, or any one of them, should be permitted to maintain the action.

I know that is my position on this subject. I hope I have made it clear.

Mr. President, at this time I desire to have a vote on my amendment.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, if the Senator from West Virginia is pressing for a vote at this time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Scruggam
Bridges	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Langer	Truman
Chavez	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Tydings
Connally	McClellan	Vandenberg
Danaher	McFarland	Van Nuys
Davis	McKellar	Wagner
Downey	McNary	Wallgren
Eastland	Maloney	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
George	Murray	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained on official business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to strike from the first committee amendment certain language,

as amended, beginning on page 2, line 13.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

SECRETARY OF STATE HULL AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hull Talks Sense" appearing in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., of September 14, 1943. The editorial refers to Mr. Hull's recent statement over the radio concerning our foreign relations and our situation generally.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HULL TALKS SENSE

Secretary of State Cordell Hull talked sense last Sunday evening in his analysis of the Nation's post-war aims. Plumping squarely for United States participation in world affairs after the war, Secretary Hull based his recommendations on simple, practical grounds that the man in the street can understand. In other words, he avoided altruistic twaddle and sweet-scented moonshine to put the whole business where it belongs as a means of accomplishing good for everybody through the effort of everybody.

Secretary Hull wants: An international police force that can and will be allowed to slap down any aggressor; an international court of justice empowered to settle legal differences among nations; sound trade relations established on a basis of mutual benefit and profit, and such help to dependent or backward nations as will allow them to develop to the stage where they can and will help themselves. This sort of program is as refreshing as a cool drink of water in hot weather. It is the type of plan that offers benefits for all in return for the work of all, which is no more and no less than any people should ask or want.

Particularly encouraging is Secretary Hull's emphasis on sound trade and other economic relations based on the actuating principle of enlightened self-interest to the end that all would profit in proportion to endeavors expended and good will displayed. Nowhere in Secretary Hull's talk was there any hint of establishing a world W. P. A. or lowering the standards of the more advanced nations if the backward ones cannot be persuaded to raise theirs. Mr. Hull proposes to level up instead of leveling down, which is right down the alley of the average worth-while American. We hope this sort of businesslike approach will prevail.

Mr. McKELLAR. The statement of Secretary of State Hull has been well received by the entire country. It contains a very great amount of good hard common sense, and should be read by every American.

Tennessee is proud of Secretary Hull, proud of the position he takes, and is practically unanimously behind him. I believe the country is, too. This is no time for "isms," and we do not find any "isms" in Mr. Hull's statement.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I call attention to an article which I wish to submit for the RECORD. It is an article appearing on Thursday, September 16, 1943, in the Washington Evening Star by Mr. Raymond Moley entitled "Mr. Hull and His Critics."

We all recall that Mr. Moley was at one time an Under Secretary of State under Mr. Hull, but later resigned because dif-

ferences of opinion arose between him and Mr. Hull. I was one of those who sided with Mr. Hull at the time in that controversy and for that reason it gives me the greatest pleasure to read to the Senate Mr. Moley's article. I want, figuratively speaking, to take my hat off to Mr. Moley for his clear and convincing statement concerning our foreign policy under Mr. Hull, and to compliment him on his broad and generous attitude.

I invite Senators to listen to this short article, written by Mr. Raymond Moley, who, as I have stated, almost at the beginning of President Roosevelt's administration had a difference with Mr. Hull. The article, as I believe, shows what he in his heart thinks of Mr. Hull. It reads as follows:

The critics of Secretary Hull learned on Sunday night that he is no reed shaken by the wind. To examine with care his interpretation of American foreign policy is to feel the assurance that our external affairs are being conducted in the light of good traditions.

The critics will not be satisfied, of course. One of them has already said that Mr. Hull's speech merely rattled the bones of international law. This is like saying that Chief Justice Stone is rattling the bones of the Constitution.

It is a very sensible comparison. I continue reading:

The bones of international law are not dead. To imply that they are is to say that all men of good will and intelligence have created in the international relations of 3,000 years vanishes at the first whiff of powder.

Wars do not mark the failure of international law; they merely indicate that there is a vast area of international relations which lies beyond the scope of international law. That area, Mr. Hull says, is being explored and, in building post-war arrangements, will be explored further in a non-partisan conciliatory spirit.

It is clear that Mr. Hull's main purpose in his speech was to indicate that our diplomacy has labored to save lives in this war and to make easier the thrusts of military force. In wartime, that is what a State Department is for. If it should work to make Europe over permanently, while war is still raging, the war itself might ultimately be very much more costly in lives and in time. If, for example, we seek to precipitate revolutions when we still have a chance to eliminate an enemy wholesale, we add to the agonies of both victor and vanquished. Mr. Hull makes the case—and the facts have amply proved his case—that in Spain, in Vichy, and in north Africa, our diplomacy served well as a primary aid to military power.

In acting as such, Mr. Hull and his department have relied upon a tradition of international law which his critics would scrap whenever they dislike the internal affairs of another country—the traditional principle of recognition. That principle was discarded by Wilson in 1913, in the Mexican affair. It was set aside in our relations with Russia for 15 years. But it is still the only permanent workable policy under which international affairs can proceed.

With reference to Mr. Hull's attitude toward Russia, this writer has some basis for a judgment, for he served in the Department during the months before the recognition of Russia in 1933. There was never any indication of prejudice toward Russia on Mr. Hull's part then, when, if ever, it was likely to manifest itself. Nor have events since that time revealed any such bias. To

suggest that such a bias exists is to impair relations with Russia, which are now a matter of life or death.

There are many post-war questions about which there may be honest disagreement with Mr. Hull. But the country is fortunate in having had, since we entered the war, so steady a hand as his in the State Department.

Again, Mr. President, I say that, coming from Mr. Moley, what I have read is an excellent expression.

Mr. President, one other statement, and I shall be through. The article of Mr. Moley is particularly interesting in view of some of the critical publications which have recently appeared concerning Mr. Hull's fine, American, statesman-like utterances.

One critic in attacking Mr. Hull's position has seen fit to denounce our foreign policy for the past 40 years, and to undertake to ridicule Mr. Hull and also our foreign policy. He was especially hard on Mr. Wilson's attempted League of Nations. I agree with Mr. Hull rather than with this critic. The Monroe Doctrine has not ceased to exist, and in substance was never more alive than it was the other day when a South American nation, which had been flooded with Nazi propaganda for years, seeing the Nazi regime was soon to fall to pieces, wanted to get on the American band wagon. Secretary Hull's reply was, in effect, to state to that nation that the Monroe Doctrine was still in force and the United States would brook no tampering with it either by European nations or by any American nation.

Mr. President, since 1900 we have had some very able and splendid Secretaries of State. This critic animadverts on our foreign policy for the past forty-odd years. I want to say that in that time we have had some of the ablest Secretaries of State that any nation has ever had. I will mention all their names because they were all worthy men. I begin in 1900 with John Hay, followed by Elihu Root, Robert Bacon, Philander C. Knox. I do not know how many Members of the present Senate served with Mr. Knox, but I had several years' service with him, and I may say that he was one of the ablest men in the Senate at that time and one of the ablest men in the country. Following Mr. Knox there came William Jennings Bryan, Robert Lansing, Bainbridge Colby, Charles Evans Hughes. While I have not always agreed with Mr. Hughes, he made a great Secretary of State, as we all know, and that he should be criticized while we are at war with another nation to me is not seemly.

Then came Frank B. Kellogg. A number of us served with Mr. Kellogg in this body, and we all know that he was an able man.

He was followed by Henry L. Stimson, who is now Secretary of War. Lastly, now occupying the great office of Secretary of State is Cordell Hull.

In that 40 years America's position among the nations of the earth has constantly improved; indeed, so constantly and so effectively has it improved that today it stands as high as any other na-

tion on earth and our diplomatic advice and leadership is followed by many other nations, and is, I believe, respected by all nations. Our outstanding purpose in diplomatic matters is, and has been during the life of the Republic, to make plain that we want no other nation's territory and want no indemnities and no reparations; that we want no interference by European nations further establishing themselves in any part of America; that we simply want the good will and esteem of all nations; that we want to be helpful to other nations whenever we can; that we want peaceably to trade with other nations and have them trade with us on terms of justice, fairness, and honesty; and that we simply want to live in peace and harmony with the rest of the world. That is a very simple foreign-relations policy, but it is the American foreign policy. We do not want to take other people's territory; we do not want to take other people's business; we merely desire, in this very simple way, to live with the other nations of the world in peace and harmony.

This is what Washington meant when he said we wanted "no entangling alliances with other nations"; this is what Monroe meant when he announced his justly celebrated doctrine. This is what Wilson meant when he said that we wanted no other nation's territory and no indemnities and no reparations. It is an exceedingly simple policy, and it seems to me that not only our own people but the people of other nations should respect it. It has been disregarded time and again, and it is necessary that in the future we be able to protect this general doctrine. Secretary Hull has outlined our policy in the most excellent and conservative way, and so far as he has gone, I for one certainly approve his position, and I believe the American people approve the position he so cogently and clearly stated last Sunday night.

Mr. President, it is easy to criticize, but, in my judgment, when everything seems to be coming our way, when our soldiers are winning on every front, when our stock is going up all over the world, when it looks as if the war will be settled before very long, I believe much earlier than most people expect, it seems to me is no time for columnists and other critics to indulge in criticism of our present Secretary of State. Some of them even go so far as to indulge in criticism of our foreign policy for the past forty-odd years. To all that, I demur; and so I have thought it wise to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I need not reiterate to those present my personal views on the amendment now pending. I have stated on the floor of the Senate that the adoption of the

amendment would cut the very vitals out of the bill. I would rather see the bill defeated than to see the amendment agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to strike from the first committee amendment certain language beginning on page 2, line 13, and continuing to line 17. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. I announce the following general pairs on this question:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; and

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who would vote "yea," has a pair on this question with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily detained.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—18

Alken	Langer	Robertson
Ball	Millikin	Stewart
Danaher	Moore	Thomas, Idaho
Gillette	Murray	Tunnell
Gurney	Overton	Wheeler
Holman	Revercomb	Willis

NAYS—39

Andrews	Ferguson	McKellar
Bailey	George	Maloney
Bankhead	Green	Radcliffe
Barbour	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Burton	Hawkes	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Hill	Truman
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Connally	Kilgore	Van Nuys
Davis	Lucas	Wagner
Downey	McCarran	Wallgren
Eastland	McClellan	White
Ellender	McFarland	Wiley

NOT VOTING—39

Austin	Clark, Mo.	O'Mahoney
Blibo	Gerry	Pepper
Bone	Glass	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Scruggs
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Buck	Lodge	Taft
Bushfield	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Maybank	Tobey
Byrd	Mead	Tydings
Capper	Murdoch	Walsh
Chandler	Nye	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	Wilson

So Mr. REVERCOMB's amendment to the amendment of the committee, as amended, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] was rejected, I now bring to the attention of the Senate a letter written by the attorney for the former Governor of the State of Kansas, Mr. Ratner. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] stated that the Attorney General of the United States might at times be depended upon to do his duty. There is no disposition on my part to minimize the honesty or the efficiency or the ability of the Attorney General of the United States, but I desire now to bring to the attention of the Senate a case in which the Attorney General, after an investigation lasting over a year, has not said that there is basis for the action requested.

Mr. President, I shall read a letter written by the attorney for the former Governor of Kansas, Mr. Ratner, because the case therein cited is, I believe, typical of what is going to happen to the billions and billions of dollars of which

the taxpayers of the United States have already been defrauded and are going to continue to be defrauded by a bunch of racketeers, crooks, and scoundrels. I read as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am very glad to supply you with some of the details of the Sunflower ordnance works fraud which bears so vitally on H. R. 1203, in which we are both interested.

The Sunflower works is a powder plant being built under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract—

The very thing that a few moments ago the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] condemned.

The Sunflower works is a powder plant being built under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract by Wm. S. Lozier, Inc.-Broderick & Gordon as architect, engineer, manager, agents in behalf of the Federal Government. For these architectural, engineering, and managerial services, they are to receive a fixed fee and may subcontract out the actual work on a lump sum or fixed-fee basis, to subcontractors or to themselves.

So, Mr. President, we now have the basis under which they have been operating for years.

This plant is located at De Soto, Kans., about 30 miles southwest of Kansas City, and will consist of 3,150 buildings constructed with Wm. S. Lozier, Inc., of Rochester, N. Y., as architect and Broderick & Gordon of Denver, Colo., as the constructing engineers. The project originated with an initial contract which called for the expenditure of—

Mind you, Senators—

of \$56,000,000 but expanded into a complex net of addenda and subcontracts which involved the expenditure of approximately \$129,000,000.

So, Mr. President, we have seen this contract rise from an estimated \$56,000,000 to the point where they have already spent \$129,000,000. I am speaking of this particularly at this time when the third-war-loan drive is under way, when we have the Back the Attack drive on, and I wish to show how money has been wasted and squandered almost beyond belief.

To investigate thoroughly a proposition of such magnitude needs months, but, from the comparatively few items cited below, you will see that the scratching of the surface which has been done exposes a quagmire of graft, and you will feel yourself justified in throwing back into Senator VAN NUYS' teeth his accusation that you have, by upholding the informer law, "given protection to thieves and crooks."

Mr. President, I did not expect very many Senators to stay in the Chamber while I was speaking this afternoon. Some time ago when the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] told of the terrible things which took place in connection with the manufacture of war material by the Anaconda Cable & Wire Co., there were only 11 Senators upon the floor, and although the case to which I now call attention is of greater importance than even the Elk Hills exposure, I see only 9 Senators actually present at this moment.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. That may be explained, I will say to my dear friend, by the fact that some of us are obliged to be in attendance at meetings of the Military Affairs Committee and other committees which are now in session. As interested as I am in the Senator's discourse and as sympathetic as I am with his statement, I must leave the Chamber in a few minutes to attend a committee meeting.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am extremely sorry to see the Senator from Oregon go. I wish he would stay. But, Mr. President, what I have here in my hand is the result of months of work, and is paid for, not by the Federal Government, but by private taxpayers of the United States, who are so disgusted at the lack of cooperation they have received from the Attorney General of the United States that they have spent thousands of dollars of their own money in connection with this matter.

For example, Mr. President, one item in connection with this matter is that of lead pencils. The contractor bought 1,000,000 lead pencils at 9 cents apiece, when anyone of us can go out and buy pencils at 2 for a nickel. Think of the contractor buying 1,000,000 pencils. For what purpose? He could not possibly use a million lead pencils on a contract for the building of 3,150 buildings. That is simply a small sample of what the attorney for the former Governor of Kansas says is a "quagmire of graft." The attorney for the Governor in his letter continues:

From the inception of the project to date, carloads of material have been left exposed to the weather, to warp and rust, in spite of a contract which demands proper storage of materials; carloads of new and thoroughly usable lumber have been burned daily while farmers are unable to get what they need to build chicken houses and outbuildings and building contractors throughout the country have had to close up their businesses for want of lumber. Over ravines on the reservation culverts were laid of heavy, new dimension lumber, were used weeks or months; torn out by bulldozers or caterpillars when the road was moved; and, while the lumber was still wholly usable, it was trucked off to the firing pit and burned. This represented not only the cost in dollars of a much needed commodity but represented, too, our virgin forests, the manpower needed to transform the timber into usable form, and its transportation by railroads and trucks from the forests to Sunflower. Large quantities of lumber were broken and cracked by inexcusably careless unloading practices and were crushed by bulldozers and caterpillars. Lumber cut to measure by carpenters and stacked and labeled, "Do not use," was carted away and burned, representing lumber and labor loss.

Mr. President, this letter is not written by a so-called racketeer. It is not written by one who, as the distinguished Senator from Indiana, who is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said, "was worse than Al Capone of Chicago." This letter is written by the attorney for the former Governor of Kansas, Mr. Ratner, whose term expired only a few months ago. The letter continues:

Millions of pounds of concrete were defectively mixed of substandard material with lumps much larger than the specifications

permitted. Mudballs, sometimes as big as buckets, were in the aggregate, not occasionally but day after day, to such an extent that it was necessary to put two men at the conveyors to fish them out. Concrete mixes were not varied, in accordance with good building practice, to conform to the uses for which the concrete was to be put or to the specifications; but pours for piers, columns, floors, foundations, walls, platforms, etc., were made from the same mix with the result that walls cracked and crumbled and piers had to be torn down and reconstructed. William S. Broderick, one of the defendants, held stock in the subcontracting company furnishing rock for cement work and holding the roadbuilding contract at Sunflower. We understand no prime contractor may own stock in any subcontracting company furnishing material.

So, Mr. President, I submit you may have a violation of the contract there.

The letter goes on to say:

Structural steel was omitted from buildings where the most ordinary good building practice demanded its incorporation. The testimony of Col. E. E. Taylor, representative of the Army engineers on the job, admits the collapse of foundations and walls where the steel was omitted because, he maintained, it was cheaper to build and see what happened than to build according to tested and accepted engineering practices.

Why, the buildings fell down, they were so poorly constructed. Yet, Mr. President, the letter goes on to say:

Yet steel was burned on the reservation in large quantities—kegs of nails (steel and brass or copper), kegs of bolts and plumbing fittings, lengths of pipe, hundreds of guards for electric lights that had never been attached and used, tons of iron rails from tramlines, etc. Twenty tons of steel cut and shaped for the roof of the reservoir were buried by a bulldozer.

And that at a time, Mr. President, when on the farms in my State of North Dakota loyal, patriotic men and women were gathering together every scrap of iron and steel they could possibly locate, while down in Kansas that crooked outfit was, as the letter says, burying tons of steel, kegs of bolts, and plumbing outfits, lengths of pipe, hundreds of guards for electric lights, and a great deal of other material.

The letter goes on to say:

The plans had been changed; and when the attention of an official was called to the wrecked roofing by an employee, the official remarked, "It is too bad, but there is nothing we can do about it now"; and the operator of the bulldozer declared he had orders to bury the steel. This, with you and me and all the children of America picking up nails from the streets and salvaging milk-bottle caps and giving up trophies of World War No. 1, brought home by its heroes from the battlefields of 1917, so that our fighting men at the front may be sure of all of the weapons of war that they need.

That is what happened.

The writer of the letter goes on to say:

Hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of pipe line were intentionally laid defectively, over unfit and untamped fills, off grade, without T's, gate and cross valves, with lead cooked until the sulfur content was gone and it would not seal, so that gangs of workmen could come back and excavate again and the fittings could be added and the ditches again filled and more costs might accrue for the Government to pay for.

Mr. President, I repeat that the letter is not one from some racketeer. It is from the attorney for the former Governor of Kansas. In his letter he warns the Senate of the scores and hundreds of lawsuits that we shall have to face before the taxpayers of America get what is justly due them.

He goes on to say:

The inspectors protested, but they were unable to do anything to protect the Government's rights and force conformance with the requirements of the contract between the Government and William S. Lozier, Inc.-Broderick & Gordon. Frank C. Delle Cese, acting in behalf of the A. E. M., posted an order to all inspectors: "Do not stop any work. Do not give any orders at any time." The job of inspection degenerated into the making of progress reports which took about 5 minutes a day by the admissions of many inspectors. There are some 700 inspectors at Sunflower being paid about \$1,932,000 for inspection it did not get. Add to that figure the substandard material and construction that went into the structure and the labor and material involved in the necessary reconstruction; and the Government's loss is multiplied again.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the letter, and I read further from it:

Consider, Senator, that one building out there, No. 4015 joined to 242-3 in a T-shaped structure, line D, nitro cotton, a building which should have cost the Government no more than \$3,500, has cost \$9,800. It was torn down three times and built four. Each time the structure went up added to the material and the labor that the taxpayers of the United States are paying for and the cost-plus that the wrongdoers are putting into their pockets.

The one building just referred to is an extreme but not an isolated case. Many hundreds of foundations have cracked and sagged; and rebuilding is a common occurrence which can perhaps be calculated accurately only by putting an auditing force on the books of William S. Lozier, Inc.-Broderick & Gordon.

The excess amount of water in the concrete mix, which shows up constantly in the log reports on the cylinder tests, increased the amount of the concrete poured. The foremen received bonuses based on the amount poured.

The more water they poured, the more bonuses they received.

I continue to read:

The larger the pour, the bigger the bonus, the higher the cost, the larger the cost-plus. There is a concrete dump at the plant where each shift dumped its excess mix. It is a sea; yet much has been broken out and carried away to another dump, involving more labor, transportation, and equipment.

Literally hundreds of workmen, according to their own statements—

Mind you, Mr. President, this is sworn testimony—

have been hidden out at Sunflower, sometimes in ones and twos, sometimes whole gangs of steamfitters, carpenters, plumbers, cement finishers, laborers, whose hourly wage went from 90 cents per hour up. Sometimes they hid out under orders for hours at a time. Other times they were idle for days for lack of material. Materials arrived daily in carload lots; yet men and material did not get together, and men were idle while they swear material was burned and run over by bulldozers and left unstacked and unsheltered in the open to rust and warp.

Why, Mr. President, I say that with that kind of supervision, not a single taxpayer in America should buy one bond if this Government and its War Department cannot protect its people and the citizens of a State from paying \$129,000,000 when the contract reads \$56,000,000. I submit that until that kind of situation is remedied, the Senate should be ashamed to ask any boy or girl to take his or her little savings out of the savings banks and buy War bonds.

The writer continues:

We have instances of 1,000,000 pencils purchased at 9 cents each, with a retail value of two for 5 cents; of doors sold to our Government for \$10.50 each but bought for \$4.97 each; of orders for lumber marked "Rush," which thereby increased delivery costs, while lumber was being burned at the plant; of the purchase of lumber, tractors, heavy motor equipment, etc., from favored vendors with no competitive bidding (in spite of contractual demands for competitive bidding) and of kick-backs to the A. E. M.

Other specific details of interest are: Three men on separate shifts (three shifts of 8 hours each) were employed 2 or 3 months at a labor cost of \$1,500, \$1,000, and \$900 to pump water from a building after the sinking of an elevator shaft opened a spring. This was building 1800-1. The spring was finally cut out, as it should have been in the beginning, releasing the men and the pump to other work. Almost equally ridiculous, if not more so, was the practice of keeping two able-bodied men per shift in the wash house, where the water kegs were cleaned, to tend fires in small stoves that warmed the place.

The labor cost on three C. C. C. type buildings which were torn down and brought from Iowa was \$55,000, when \$15,000 would have paid for the labor and material to build similar structures of brick.

W. P. B. regulation L-158 restricts the purchase of parts; but Sunflower storage warehouses are full of parts forbidden to be stored.

We have evidence of pay-roll padding and checks issued in the names of terminated employees and evidence of butchers, cooks, barbers, redcaps, elevator operators put on the rolls as inspectors, steamfitters, cement finishers, carpenters, and plumbers and given the wages of skilled workers, which vary around \$1.50 per hour, according to the craft.

A. E. M. admits that the cement content was 6 percent short in the aggregate; that labor was 35 percent inefficient (the latter would amount to an approximate labor waste of \$25,000,000); that roads were built according to a system that had been proved costly and inefficient in other governmental construction. Leavenworth, I believe, is one example, Leonard Wood, another.

There were numerous instances where material that was rejected and was admittedly unfit for use was incorporated into the structures by order of superior authority. For instance, 18 carloads of rock with liberal mixtures of mudballs were rejected but went into the mix just the same.

One overcharge on cement, \$56,000.

Dirt moved at a contract price of \$2.50 per cubic yard (which price should have been \$1.50 per cubic yard, according to the prevailing scale) was so manipulated by hauling one yard of dirt in a five-yard capacity truck and making a five-yard charge therefor and by additional pay for excessive overhauls that the cost was pyramided to \$20 per cubic yard. In the end, the job turned out to be a matter of \$5,000,000, when at \$2.50 a cubic yard, without manipulation, it would have been only a \$625,000 job, which means that at the \$2.50 charge there was an overcharge to the Government of \$4,625,000.

This overcharge does not take into consideration the cost of unnecessary labor employed or any charge for equipment, the cost of fuel for the equipment, and the wear and tear.

Forty-one thousand dollars was actually paid for the laying of a 24-inch water main from the north to the south bank of the Kaw River, after a bid of \$15,000 was rejected for the same job.

In other words, Mr. President, men offered to lay this 24-inch water main for \$15,000. The bid was rejected, and then this contractor was paid \$41,000 for the actual laying of the 24-inch water main from the north to the south bank of the Kaw River.

Last October, November, December, approximately 2,100,000 yards of earth was moved for 56 cents per cubic yard. This yardage was arrived at by using scoops represented as being of 20-yard capacity but holding only 12 yards and by using other scoops represented as being of 12-yard capacity but holding only 6 yards. One yard of dirt was hauled in a 5-yard capacity truck, and a charge was made for 5 yards. Also, the movement was made needlessly from place to place. This dirt-moving job, too, bears investigation.

Insurance frauds are more than indicated. The Government insurance plan calls for the insurance of only the vehicles leaving the reservation; but the Government plan has not been conformed to at Sunflower at least not until a very recent date. It will be noticed that the employment of numbers of unneeded workmen would not only increase labor costs but would automatically increase insurance costs and also the amount due the contractors under cost-plus.

The substitution of substandard material for standard is found in concrete, lumber (grade 3 for grade 1), rock, etc.; and, in most cases, the prices paid were for the standard material. Col. E. E. Taylor admits this in his testimony before the Truman committee.

This plant as expanded demands the expenditure of approximately as much money as did the War of 1812 in its entirety; and the project, when complete, will be substandard and in many respects not in accord with the specifications. This may be the reason that rumor persists that from one-half to three-fourths of the plant is to be scrapped and that a minimum of \$10,000,000 in material will never be used.

Machinery bases have been put in and torn out time after time, in one case a group of buildings had one side torn out and reset because the machinery bases did not fit the space allotted. After the installation of machinery, the delicate alignments which many require will undoubtedly be jeopardized by the collapse and settling of defective bases under vibration, and there is a possibility that the lives of the workers will be endangered because of the faulty construction and that the quality of the products needed by our fighting men at the front will be impaired.

The foregoing is taken from information that has been turned over to me from time to time. We have much more.

I may add that I have the complaint before me. The defendants are: W. S. Broderick, D. G. Gordon, partners, doing business as Broderick & Gordon, and Wm. S. Lozier and Wm. S. Lozier, Inc., F. C. Delle Cese, Earl S. Stone, U. S. Transit Mix Corporation, Cory & Joslin, Inc., a corporation, William E. Joslin, P. B. Gibson, C. R. Walker, James L. McClenahan and James W. McClenahan, partners doing business as Cory-Joslin and Macnsons.

Continuing to read from the letter:

The lawyers for the defendants in this case boasted openly in court last Monday,

July 5, that Congress would put an end to the Sunflower fraud case in 10 days.

I judge from the last vote taken, Mr. President, that they are right.

Senator FERGUSON said for publication that H. R. 1203 is directed against this particular suit. The contractors at Sunflower brag of political influence which makes them immune to investigation and joke about stretching out the project so they will not have to pay all their income tax in 1 year. It is common rumor that a son-in-law of the Secretary of the Treasury is prominent in Lord Electrical Co. (Evans-Lord are the electrical subcontractors at Sunflower; Evans of Kansas City and Lord of New York)—

Because I cannot prove the next statement I shall not read it. It simply says that this man is related to a member of the Cabinet.

Continuing:

These rumors are not confirmed. I repeat them because of their persistence and your saying you have means of seeking out the truth which are not open to us.

We have been refused information as to the ownership, officers, stockholders, and directors of the U. S. Transit Mix Concrete Corporation of New York by the authorities of New York State for the purported reason that these public records are confidential.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator stated that I said that the pending bill would put an end to the case to which he has referred.

Mr. LANGER. I said a publication so stated.

Mr. FERGUSON. How would the bill in its present form put an end to the case? How could it possibly put an end to that case?

Mr. LANGER. Why would it not put an end to the case? This case was brought after June 15, 1942.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would merely mean that the plaintiff would be compelled to give the facts to the Attorney General, and he, on behalf of the people, would become the plaintiff in the case and prosecute it. The amendment which I have offered would allow the present plaintiff in this case to receive up to 10 percent of the damages. In other words, this case would be prosecuted, and, in my opinion, should be prosecuted. However, it should be prosecuted first by the Attorney General, the responsible agent of the United States. For whatever work the plaintiff has done in the case he should be paid due compensation. Therefore it would not end the case. I never made such a statement, and it could not possibly end the case. It would merely transfer it to the Attorney General's Office and the present plaintiff would receive up to 10 percent, as the court might determine.

Mr. LANGER. Ah, Mr. President, let me state to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan that Mr. Ratner and his lawyers have time and time again appealed to the Attorney General. Men were sent out to investigate. They reported back that they could not find anything.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. That being true, if the pending measure should be passed, after 6 months had elapsed, the plaintiff could go ahead with his suit just the same as he could before this so-called amendment should be adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator has missed the point of what these men are doing. I call attention to the case allegedly involving Frank Hague. I have the files here with me. The case stinks to high heaven. The Government brought action in 1935, brought it all right, but let it lie there during 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940. It was only when private persons went in that final action was taken. Not only that, but I have the letters here from the Attorney General of the United States, refusing to have anything to do with the case.

Here is a letter written by Thurman Arnold on April 16, 1942, to the attorney for the taxpayer who was suing those persons in New Jersey. The letter states:

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of April 6, 1942, in regard to the above-entitled case. Although the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit rejected the views submitted by the United States in *Marcus v. Hess*, the attitude of the Attorney General in respect to suits of this character has not changed. Consequently, I am unable to authorize Government officials to cooperate with you in the prosecution of the above case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I submit, Mr. President, that in the *Marcus* against *Hess* case in Pennsylvania the Attorney General's office of the United States moved heaven and earth to prevent the plaintiff from getting a judgment. After all those facts were called to the attention of the Attorney General's office, nothing was done. It was only after that suit was brought, only after the plaintiffs had dug up all the facts, only after a jury had given the plaintiffs a verdict for \$315,000, and after the case had been appealed by the defendants, that for the first time we find the Attorney General's office appearing.

What did they do? Why, Mr. President, although the defendants offered to pay \$100,000 in settlement, yet the Attorney General's office designated Thurman Arnold to appear in opposition. I suggest that the brief which was filed be read. That brief held that the plaintiffs should not recover. We find the spectacle of the Attorney General appearing for the defendants. The circuit court did hold for the defendants, and then the plaintiffs appealed, and it was the Supreme Court of the United States which reinstated the judgment. That is why those plaintiffs received \$315,000. They received it in spite of the Attorney General of the United States.

So we return to the Sunflower case, to which the junior Senator from Michigan has referred. It may be that if that case is turned over to the Attorney General's office they will not do anything more about it than was done in the Frank Hague in New Jersey, or in the *Marcus* against *Hess* case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with much that the Senator from North Dakota has said relative to the case in New Jersey. However, under the present language of the pending bill that case is not touched. I know that the Senator from North Dakota is saying much that is true with regard to the Sunflower case, because I was on the Truman committee and investigated it. An action should be brought by the Attorney General.

The letter from Assistant Attorney General Arnold is just the kind of a letter that would permit a plaintiff to bring a suit under the present law when the Attorney General refused to bring the suit. I believe the time has come when we must choose between the evil of having an Attorney General who fails in his sworn duty to take care of cases where fraud is committed against the United States, and permitting any lawyer, whether he has the facts or not, at any time, and under any circumstances, to bring suit. I am inclined to the opinion that we should take the view that we will hold responsible to the people of the United States the Attorney General, and when he fails in his duty, it is time for the people of the United States to see that they get another Attorney General. We can control one man in the Attorney General's office much better than we can control thousands of lawyers all over the country. I am inclined to the opinion that we could do it in the way provided for in the bill, and that is why I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. President, I agree that many of the things stated by the Senator from North Dakota are true. I believe that any man who buys a million lead pencils, as the Senator has said, is wrong and should be prosecuted for that fraud. The statute now provides that he can be penalized \$2,000 plus double the actual damages. We should hold responsible the Attorney General of the United States and, as I have already said, if we find him failing in his duty then it is time that we have a new Attorney General. However, it is easier to control him than it is to control hundreds and thousands of lawyers all over the country.

So, Mr. President, there is no dispute between the Senator from North Dakota and myself on the facts. I, too, want every fraud case prosecuted, but I think the people of the United States should have those cases prosecuted by the Attorney General, their responsible officer, rather than by private citizens.

The responsibility to prevent frauds is on the Government as well as on the citizen. When the citizen gives the facts to the Government the case should be prosecuted by the Government, but the citizen should be able to use his original evidence to prosecute in case the Government does not do so.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not know of any man upon the Senate floor, in view of his very distinguished record in connection with the prosecution of crooks and grafters, that I would rather have interrogate me than the junior

Senator from Michigan himself. Now he says he wants to hold the Attorney General of the United States alone responsible. That is not done in Michigan; it is not done in my State; it is not done in any State of the Union of which I know. Whenever a sufficient number of taxpayers are dissatisfied, whenever they think an attorney general or county attorney is not doing his duty, they can go to a court, and, under the statute, the court can set aside the attorney general and name a prosecutor, either in a criminal or civil case. If my memory serves me correctly, that is exactly what happened in the State of the junior Senator from Michigan himself.

Why, in heaven's name, I ask, Mr. President, assuming that there is a corrupt Attorney General, assuming another Harry M. Daugherty in the Attorney General's office, why should the American people wait for years, during which time witnesses may die and the testimony may disappear, before a suit of this kind can be brought? How, I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan, are we going to get rid of an Attorney General who refuses to take action?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the answer is obvious.

Mr. LANGER. Very well, how is it going to be done?

Mr. FERGUSON. Change the administration. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGER. The Senator says "change the administration," but Mr. President, that may take 12 years [laughter]; and if it takes 12 years, then the cases are outlawed. If that is the only remedy the distinguished Senator from Michigan has, I submit it is no remedy at all.

Mr. President, that is the very crux of this entire argument. What, I ask is the distinguished Senator now occupying the chair [Mr. BURTON in the chair] going to do if this bill is passed and if there is crookedness and fraud in war contracts in Ohio? What is he going to do when a constituent comes to him and says, "Mr. Senator, they stole \$100,000 on this deal; we want the case prosecuted"? All the Senator can say is, "I cannot do anything about it; I cannot go to a county attorney; I cannot go to the State attorney general; I can go to only one man and that is the Attorney General of the United States. I went to him and he brought a case 2 years ago, 3 years ago, 4 years ago, 5 years ago, 6 years ago, such as the Frank Hague case." Very well. The Senator from Ohio and every other Senator in this body is helpless, for the Attorney General alone can bring the suit.

I repeat, that such practice is not customary in any State of the Union. In some States even 10 percent of the voters signing a petition and presenting it to a judge can have the judge appoint a prosecutor in a civil or a criminal case. There is no provision of that kind in this bill. Who may be Attorney General 2 years or 4 years or 6 years from now? Even if there is an honest Attorney General, he has to depend upon assistants, and who knows who the Assistant Attorney General will be who may have

charge of these war fraud cases? Do you not see, Mr. President, the position the Senate is putting the people of America into when not a single taxpayer can bring a suit except through one man? That is my objection to this bill. I do not see how the bill can possibly be amended so that it will be worth anything.

The present law was good enough for Abraham Lincoln, it has been good enough for the people of this country for 80 years, and I submit, in spite of all that has been said here, that the law has not been abused.

I have before me, Mr. President, a list of all the cases that have been brought. They number 33. It is true that in perhaps 6 or 7 of them the indictments were copied in order to bring the suit, but, as we read in the newspapers last evening, when the last case was brought all the Attorney General said was, "I had already sued them." In every future case where people are arrested, and war fraud cases brought, all the Attorney General has to do is to bring a civil suit at the same time.

Mr. President, this bill, in my judgment, goes much further. It is sought to wipe out the 33 cases that have already been brought, but it is being done without a hearing. There never was a hearing before any committee, either in the House or in the Senate. Why should not the people who are interested be heard?

Mr. President, I have here before me, coming again to the matter of the Attorney General of the United States, a report by Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, under date of January 21, 1943. What does he say? Take, for example, this overpayment case from this report of the Comptroller General of the United States of an investigation of contracts and other records of the United States Maritime Commission:

Overpayment: Based on Commission's General Order No. 24, the value of the vessel at the time of acquisition—

And the name of the vessel, by the way, was the *President Roosevelt*—

Based on Commission's General Order No. 24, the value of the vessel at the time of acquisition was only \$178,531, and since \$600,000 was paid therefor, an apparent overpayment of \$421,468.99 resulted in view of the provisions of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

There is a case. Here is another case brought to the attention of the people by Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, which is pertinent and of interest. It is a report dated August 21, 1943, less than a month ago. Let us see how these crooks and scoundrels are operating while small boys and girls are being asked to buy war bonds. Mr. Warren says:

In purchasing the five vessels from the corporation as aforesaid instead of exercising the option to repurchase the vessels sold under the written agreement of June 8, 1940, the Commission laid out and expended the sum of \$1,995,502.68 more than it should and would have expended had it exercised said option, without regard to reasonable depreciation of the vessel sold under said written

agreement, as will more fully and clearly hereafter appear.

Then it goes on and cites the instances. I have another report here from Mr. Bland, of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. It is exceedingly interesting. As I have said, it is from the House, where they have already had an investigation. I shall refer to page 7. It is of date November 24, 1942, and relates to an investigation of the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation.

It is difficult to understand why South Portland Ship should ever have entered into such a lease. It is impossible to justify it. Testifying before your committee, Mr. Newell explained the rent by stating that an officer of the Portland Terminal Co. had informed him that the property was worth \$600,000, 6-percent return on which would amount to \$36,000, but that he had made no investigation of his own to verify the value. He could offer no explanation for the inclusion in the lease of the strange and unusual provisions relating to the construction of the bridge. In response to questions concerning that provision, his testimony was that he didn't remember the lease contained such provision. He finally admitted that either the railroad company of which he is a director had driven a "sharp bargain" or "somebody was asleep" in his organization.

No prudent businessman, dealing with his own money, would ever have entered into such a lease. Its improvidence and imprudence can be explained only by keeping in mind that all costs incurred are reimbursable by the Maritime Commission.

Again, on page 9, it is stated:

Materials Handling—

The name of a corporation—

Materials Handling has never had sufficient equipment to supply all the needs of the yard. Accordingly, it has rented equipment from others, and in turn rented it to the yard at a higher rental than that which it paid. An example of the operation of this method is the following: A firm known as Truck Leasing Corporation rented a truck, supplying gasoline and oil, but without a driver, at \$6.50 per day to Hunnewell Trucking Co., hereinafter referred to as Hunnewell. Hunnewell placed a driver on the truck and rented it to Materials Handling at \$2.75 per hour. Materials Handling in turn rented the same truck with the Hunnewell driver to the yard at \$3.50 per hour.

So Senators will see that the same truck which originally rented at \$6.50 a day finally rented to the driver of the truck at \$3.50 an hour, and the United States paid the difference.

Again, on page 9 of this report, I find this:

The rental of trucks to the yard is a most profitable business. During the period from its incorporation in January 1941 to September 30, 1942, Materials Handling Corporation showed a profit of \$87,394.30, after deducting officers' salaries totaling \$38,000, and after writing off depreciation based on an 18-month life for equipment, a rate of depreciation wholly unjustified by any standard. If a 3-year life for the equipment were taken as a base—the equipment was all purchased new—the profit would be over \$107,000, after deducting the afore-mentioned salaries. Of the total of \$38,000 salaries, \$10,000 was paid to Kenneth T. Burr and \$9,875 was paid to Miss Barbara Burr, a daughter of Kenneth T. Burr. Miss Burr is 22 years of age, and is employed as a stenographer by Bancroft & Martin at a salary of \$25 per week.

But when the Government was paying the bill, her salary was jumped from \$25 a week to \$9,875 a year.

Again:

While these salaries were being paid the individuals so recompensed were all receiving very substantial salaries from Bancroft & Martin, for which firm they were chiefly working. The total profits received by Materials Handling, plus the total salaries paid, amount to \$145,000. To repeat, the total investment was \$3,000.

But the profits from the \$3,000 investment were, according to the House committee, \$145,000. To me it is a mockery to think that this administration should be going out and asking boys and girls, young men and young women, to buy War bonds when we have this kind of an administration of the fiscal affairs of the Government, when a company investing \$3,000 makes \$145,000. This is all sworn testimony. Yet the Senate committee says no one shall investigate this, that no one shall bring a suit except the Attorney General of the United States. To me it is unbelievable that the Senate of the United States of America could pass any sort of legislation of that kind.

Now let us turn to page 10 of the same report, where we find the following:

The experience of Hunnewell is equally interesting. It was not until the last part of 1941 that Materials Handling began to rent trucks from Hunnewell in any appreciable number. During the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive, Hunnewell's average profit was approximately \$2,000 per year, after deduction of officers' salaries, which never exceeded \$12,000 in any one year.

I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the years, 1936 to 1940. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who sits before me, well knows the evidence of the conditions would still be buried, if it had not been for the Truman committee, although we have appropriated \$101,000,000 for the Office of the Attorney General of the United States.

On page 10 we find this:

During the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive, Hunnewell's average profit was approximately \$2,000 per year, after deduction of officers' salaries, which never exceeded \$12,000 in any one year. It first began to receive business from Materials Handling in 1941 and in that year showed a profit of over \$5,000, after deduction of officers' salaries totaling \$24,000. For the 9-month period ended September 30, 1942, the profit of Hunnewell was \$71,000, after deduction of officers' salaries at the rate of \$36,000 per year.

That is the girl getting \$25 a week, who suddenly jumped to \$9,875 a year.

Then there is some more. I turn to page 15 of the same report:

The fees paid to South Portland Ship as of October 31, 1942, amounted to \$450,000. These fees are, for all practical purposes, net earnings of South Portland Ship. Its total investment is \$250,000. All costs and expenses incurred by it, including salaries of officers, even \$6,575 of the \$10,000 salary paid to Mr. Newell, are being reimbursed to it by the Maritime Commission. It has already received a return on its investment of almost 200 percent. Under its contracts with the Commission it is to build 84 ships. Judging by its performance to date, its fees will not exceed \$60,000 per ship, as on the ships built so far the penalties imposed for bad per-

formance keep the fees at the minimum figure. Even at the minimum figure, however, its total fees will amount to \$5,040,000, or a return of 2,000 percent on investment.

I want you to mark this well, Mr. President. Even at a minimum figure, assuming that all the penalties were imposed, the total fees will amount to \$5,040,000, or a return of 2,000 percent on the investment.

I repeat, Mr. President, here is evidence of a dividend return of 2,000 percent to a dirty outfit of this kind, which is robbing the taxpayers of this country, while we have in Washington this exhibit, "Back the Attack," attempting to get every dollar possible out of the people of Washington and vicinity to pay a concern like this 2,000 percent profit; and no action has been taken. And I have more of this kind of cases.

I have before me other cases, but I shall not read them all. If anyone is interested in them I shall be glad to present them. Some are much worse than the one I have just mentioned. One was a case in which there was merely a \$500 investment.

Mr. President, I read from page 6 of the preliminary report made by former Senator Black, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, from the Special Committee to Investigate Air Mail Contracts, in the matter of the investigation of air-mail and ocean-mail contracts. In his report former Senator Black said:

The policy of extending aid to shipping enterprises in the form of mail contracts has been constant for many years. This aid was in existence even prior to the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. Under that act and prior to the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1923, contracts were let and compensation paid as follows:

The Oceanic Steamship Co. received \$1,892,818; the Munson Steamship Line, \$1,277,151; the Export Steamship Corporation, \$341,666.66; the American South African Line, \$135,000; the Dollar Steamship Line, \$948,000; the Grace Steamship Co., \$564,003; and the New York & Porto Rico Steamship Co., \$29,070, a total of \$5,188,012.66. It will be noted that out of seven contractors under the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, six hold contracts under the Merchant Marine Act of 1923. The seventh, the New York & Porto Rico Steamship Co., was awarded a contract under the Merchant Marine Act of 1923 which expired on July 1, 1932. This seventh company is a subsidiary of the Atlantic, Gulf & West Indies Steamship Lines, which holding company controls the New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co., present contractor on routes 20 and 21.

The above résumé demonstrates clearly that since the World War it has been the continuous policy of this Nation to expend the public funds to build up and maintain a privately owned and operated American merchant marine and further demonstrates, that shipping interests have taken advantage of this policy to build up private fortunes at public expense.

The report further on speaks of the \$500 company. If any Senator is interested in the matter he can find it in hearings held by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, December 7, 8, and 12, 1942. Also hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and

Fisheries, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 15, 16, and 17, 1942.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the records of the 33 informer cases which are now pending in the United States, and I again call attention to the fact that the telegrams which I have received from the plaintiffs in these 33 lawsuits in every instance stated that the plaintiffs were not notified of any hearing before a committee of the House or of the Senate. Let us take the Kansas case, in which private individuals have expended thousands upon thousands of dollars, and have appealed time and again to the Attorney General of the United States. Certainly no one will claim that the former Governor of Kansas is a racketeer. He is in charge of bringing this case. In connection with that case private individuals have expended thousands upon thousands of dollars. Yet the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate did not do former Governor Ratner of Kansas even the courtesy of notifying him so that he might appear and protect his own interests or the interests of those who were associated with him.

We are now asked to pass the pending bill without giving former Governor Ratner or any of his associates the chance to be heard, although they are protecting the interests of the people of the United States under a statute 80 years old. Neither was he given an opportunity to appear at the time the Committee on the Judiciary met. Some persons did appear before the committee. Those were the persons who I myself notified. One of them was Mr. Coates of St. Louis. He happened to write me a letter and I telegraphed to him and told him the facts with respect to hearings. He came to Washington. I telephoned to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary who said he would give Mr. Coates 10 minutes before the committee. When Mr. Coates appeared before the committee, members of the committee became so interested in what he had to say that he remained before the committee over 2 hours, and when he had finished, the committee advised him to confer with the Assistant Attorney General, Tom Clark, and as a result of that conference Mr. Coates' case was exempted by agreement with the Assistant Attorney General of the United States.

We come back to the case of Marcus against Hess. In that case the Supreme Court, as I have previously stated, affirmed the judgment for \$315,000, and, as I stated day before yesterday, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] submitted an amendment to the pending bill, which had been passed by the House, an amendment which would make it extremely doubtful whether the officers of any court could be used to collect that judgment, and it was only after Mr. Margiotti came to Washington from Pittsburgh and had seen the Attorney General of the United States, that that matter was clarified to the extent that it was known that he could collect his portion of the judgment.

We turn again to the New Jersey case, the Hague case. In that case the judge,

Judge Fake, apologized to the defendants when he sentenced them. That represents a situation worse than that in connection with the case in Kansas City. The judge in the New Jersey case fined some of the defendants \$200, some \$400, some \$600, and some \$800, and according to newspaper accounts he apologized when he did so. He sentenced them on December 31, 1941. The defendants in that case did not plead guilty until nearly 6 years after they were arrested. And then only the small fry pled guilty. The big boys all got away. The case against every single millionaire company was dismissed. All the big boys got away, but the little fellows were held.

I have a copy of the complaint in the case before me, and we find that the United States Government entered suit last May for nearly one and a half million dollars against the same persons to whom the Federal judge apologized when he fined them. That case is pending now. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Michigan to the fact that the Government case is outlawed. The Government has already impounded the records. They are not public. A further case cannot be brought because it is outlawed. The only case left there is this pending one, because that was brought by a taxpayer in New Jersey. As the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said, the Attorney General has agreed that that case shall proceed to trial. But he agreed only after a fight was made in the Judiciary Committee. If the pending measure, which has been passed by the House, were to become the law of the land, this pending lawsuit also would be dead.

Mr. President, I have in my hand the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Marcus against Hess. It is peculiarly significant that the opinion in the case is written by a former United States Senator, who is now an associate justice of the Supreme Court, Hugo Black. I say that before any Senator votes in favor of the pending measure the least he can do for his own satisfaction is to read the opinion by Mr. Justice Black in the case of Marcus against Hess, remembering all the time that in this case the Attorney General of the United States did all he could for the defendant; that Mr. Thurman Arnold appeared in court and filed a brief for the defendants.

Read the language of Mr. Justice Black, and then remember that he is the same Mr. Black whose disclosures, made while he was a Senator, I read a few moments ago.

I shall not take time to read the entire case. On page 379 of the volume of opinions, we find that Mr. Justice Black said:

Furthermore, one of the chief purposes of the act, which was itself first passed in wartime, was to stimulate action to protect the Government against war frauds. . . . To that end, prosecuting attorneys were enjoined to be diligent in enforcement of the act's provisions, and large rewards were offered to stimulate actions by private parties should the prosecuting officers be tardy in bringing the suits.

Mr. President, that language is curiously apropos to the present situation in the United States. There are billions and billions of dollars worth of war contracts. Mr. President, at this particular time why should that law be repealed or emasculated? Under the present statute the Government cannot lose.

Mr. President, look at the facts. Let us take the Bausch & Lomb case in which that company is being sued for approximately \$45,000,000. If the plaintiffs win, the Government will get \$22,500,000. The plaintiffs will get \$22,500,000 more, but the Government will get most of that under the income taxes. Is not that correct? So, because of the actions of those plaintiffs, the Government will be \$22,500,000 richer; and added to that amount will be all the millions of dollars the Government will take out of the other half going to the plaintiffs; and also added will be \$2,000 more for each violation of which the company may be found guilty.

So, Mr. President, in heaven's name how can any one honestly object to keeping the statute just the way it is today—except a lot of war profiteers and crooks who have been defrauding the common people of the country, and who now do not want to disgorge some of the profits they illegally obtained.

Reading further from Mr. Justice Black's opinion, we find that he said:

The punishment given in that action was not intended to compensate the Government, in any manner, for damages it suffered as a result of successful execution of the conspiracy.

The whole intention of the statute was to have the Government get back for the taxpayers the money which had been wrongfully extracted from them.

So, Mr. President, to every Senator who says he does not want the United States Government run by bureaus, I submit that if the measure is passed in the shape in which it now is, the Attorney General's office, and that office alone—an office operating through an Assistant Attorney General, and no Member of the Senate knows who that person may be tomorrow—will have delegated to him its sole and exclusive power to say whether an action should be brought. I say that if that man should chance to be dishonest, he could do exactly what was done in the Frank Hague case, when the case was continued during 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940, and then dismiss the big fellows, and get the little fellows; and there would not be anything any one Senator individually could do about it except to apologize to those of his constituents who might happen to ask about a particular case which involved their particular State.

I submit that the present statute now on the books is a most desirable one. What harm can there be if 10,000 lawyers in America are assisting the Attorney General of the United States in digging up war frauds? In any case, the Attorney General can protect himself by filing a lawsuit at the time when he files the indictment.

Certainly there is nothing in the 33 cases now pending that is so important

that we must change the statute which has been on the statute books for 80 years. The other day the distinguished chairman of the committee said that these rackets are worse than any racket Al Capone ever had. However, I submit the chairman of the committee is mistaken because, so far as I know, Al Capone never got a dollar at the hands of any court or jury.

I submit that the title of the act should not be an "informer's act" but should be a "recovery act," for the recovery of money for the taxpayers of the country; and I submit that before any man can recover anything for himself he must go before a court and jury. How can that be a racket? He must submit the facts to a court and jury, and in the case of a recovery of any appreciable amount the Government will take out of the plaintiff's half a large chunk for income taxes.

So, Mr. President, in view of the facts—in view of the fact that all the lawyers for the 33 pending cases were not notified, and never had a hearing before any subcommittee—I submit that the measure should be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for hearings. We already have 6 amendments pending. Many of the Senators to whom I have talked have said they did not know anything about this matter. They have come back after being away for 2 months during the recess. They have not had an opportunity to study the measure. I believe the bill should be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that hearings should be had there. Thereafter the Judiciary Committee will be able to take such action as it may consider appropriate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the measure be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator refer to page 3 of the committee report, where the statement is made:

The Department's principal desire for the enactment of this bill—

I assume the bill as proposed to be amended is meant—

is that the United States be protected against being compelled to disclose its facts involved in any criminal prosecution it may have undertaken or is about to undertake. Their experience has shown that upon filing of such civil suits, steps are soon taken to compel discovery, by taking deposition and otherwise, in the civil suits to ascertain the facts upon which the Government is proceeding.

Would that in any way affect or injure any criminal proceedings?

Mr. LANGER. I cannot see how it would in any way at all. The theory of the argument is that fictitious suits might be brought. In other words, it is said that a defendant in a criminal case might set up a fictitious suit, and take depositions before a notary public, and so find out all about the Government's case.

I submit that here in America the Government is not concerned with putting innocent men in the penitentiary. I submit that the Government is not con-

cerned, when a man is arrested, with hiding all the evidence. Either the man is guilty or he is innocent. If the Government says he is guilty, why should not the Government be willing, even in such a case as the Senator mentions—and such cases are rare—to make the testimony known to the defendant? What objection can there be honestly to the testimony being known to the defendant? It is either true or false. I repeat, here in America we do not believe in the theory that we are going to keep the defendant in ignorance of all the testimony, and then suddenly produce it overnight, giving the innocent defendant no time to prepare to refute it, resulting in his conviction.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Murray
Andrews	Ferguson	Overton
Bailey	George	Reed
Ball	Gillette	Revercomb
Bankhead	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Guffey	Robertson
Barkley	Gurney	Scruggam
Buck	Hatch	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Hawkes	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Hill	Truman
Butler	Holman	Tunnell
Capper	Kilgore	Vandenberg
Caraway	Langer	Van Nuys
Chavez	Lucas	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Wheeler
Connally	McFarland	White
Danaher	McKellar	Wiley
Davis	Maloney	Willis
Downey	Millikin	
Eastland	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to recommit House bill 1203 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HOLMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have just been reminded of my general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. Not knowing how he would vote, I shall have to withdraw my vote. I previously voted my convictions—"yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. NARY], who is detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. I announce the following general pairs on this question:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; and

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who is detained on official business, with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea." He is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—12		
Aiken	Davis	Murray
Ball	Langer	Revercomb
Capper	Millikin	Robertson
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Thomas, Idaho

NAYS—48		
Andrews	Ellender	Maloney
Bailey	Ferguson	Overton
Bankhead	George	Reed
Barbour	Gillette	Reynolds
Barkley	Green	Scruggam
Buck	Guffey	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Gurney	Truman
Bushfield	Hatch	Tunnell
Butler	Hawkes	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hill	Van Nuys
Chavez	Kilgore	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Wallgren
Connally	McCarran	Wheeler
Danaher	McClellan	White
Downey	McFarland	Wiley
Eastland	McKellar	Willis

NOT VOTING—36

Austin	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Brewster	Lodge	Smith
Bridges	McNary	Stewart
Brooks	Maybank	Taft
Byrd	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Murdock	Tobey
Gerry	Nye	Tydings
Glass	O'Daniel	Walsh
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Holman	Pepper	Wilson

So Mr. LANGER's motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on page 2, in line 11, in the committee amendment after the words "United States" I move to amend by adding the words "as hereinbefore set forth."

My reason for offering the amendment is that on page 1, lines 6 to 10 the courts are described as "the several district courts of the United States, the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, the several district courts of the Territories of the United States."

I also move to amend in line 14, page 2, after the word "evidence" and the comma, to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or" so that it will read: "or sources."

I further move to amend in line 15 on the same page by inserting after the word "not" the word "then"; after the words "possession of" to insert the words "the United States"; and after the word "obtained" in the same line, to insert the words "from such person."

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan and I have gone over these amendments in detail. They are purely for clarification, and I hope they will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 2, line 11, after the words "United States", it is proposed to insert the words "as hereinbefore set forth"; on the same page, line 14, after the word "evidence", to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or"; on the same page, line 15, after the words "and not", to insert the word "then"; in the same line, after the words "possession of", to insert the words "the United States", and after the word "obtained", in the same line, to insert the words "from such person."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the vote will be taken on the amendments en bloc. The Chair hears no objection. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to address a question or two to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in relation to the pending bill. I

have been privileged to listen to the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I think he has made out a pretty good case to this point, that there has been a tremendous amount of fraud in dealing with the Government by probably a relatively small number of our citizens. There is no evidence to show the amount of the fraud in dollars compared with the total expenditures, but the question I wish to address at this time to the distinguished Senators whom I have mentioned is, With the amendments now incorporated in the bill, will they kindly tell me if we pass the bill in its present shape whether there is any danger of any rights the public may have being prejudiced or being lost? After all, if, due to bad men dealing with the Government, we have a loss of the people's money, there should be certain instrumentalities in Government available to recapture the lost money, and I should like to know how the bill will provide adequate protection for the recovery of money the Government has lost through fraud. I will address the question first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I must admit that I am grateful to my colleague the Senator from Wisconsin for the obvious note of confidence sounded by his addressing such a question to me, but I think, properly, it should be answered by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who is in charge of the bill. My own efforts in connection with it have been, as my colleagues know, in the direction of attempting to perfect it in order to accomplish the objectives which the Senator from Indiana seeks to achieve, and, since he is in charge of the bill for the committee, I think the question properly should be addressed to him.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, as I understand the question of the Senator from Wisconsin, it is how is the public protected in the bringing of suits for fraud and resulting damages? Is that the question?

Mr. WILEY. That is substantially the question. I might amplify it in this way: The original law, as enacted in 1863, was passed, as I understand, in the interest of the public. Recognizing that war frauds had been committed, that the Government itself, probably, did not have adequate information that individuals had, therefore, the law gave the right to individuals by informer suits to recover funds which rightfully belonged to the Government, and the informer was given a certain percentage of such funds recovered. We have proceeded in that way over the years, and some 33 suits have been prosecuted in this period of 80 years. Now, all at once, we find ourselves in a war period incident to which our national expenditures are increased from about \$15,000,000,000 to \$100,000,000,000 a year, and, of course, great opportunity for fraud arises. Now we come to the point where it is proposed to modify the existing law. Of course, there is going to be much said, as considerable has been said, to the effect that an implication might be drawn that we are trying to

protect somebody, that we are trying so to provide that people who have committed fraud will not be held accountable. I think the matter should be plainly set forth in the RECORD so that it will appear definitely and clearly how the public interest is to be protected; and I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Indiana can tell us that.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I have twice gone over in detail that aspect of the bill, once yesterday and once before the Senate recessed. Without going into it at length now let me say that the House bill now before the Senate proposed to repeal the old statute of 1863 in its entirety. The bill came to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and after laboring many days, as the Senator from Wisconsin well knows, as he is a distinguished member of the committee, the amendments submitted and now appearing in the bill were agreed upon almost unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill is designed to prevent fraud upon the part of racketeering informers and their lawyers, running into millions of dollars at this time.

In 1863 the Government did not have an F. B. I. with hundreds of trained investigators and agents all over the United States; the office and staff of the Attorney General were comparatively small; the Treasury Department did not have agents and investigators as it has today. So at that time the Government was largely dependent upon individual informers to secure information as to frauds being perpetrated on the Government, and such informers were offered a handsome reward of 50 percent of the recovery for supplying the information.

I am not going to say that all the informers and their attorneys are racketeers; but the main purpose of the Judiciary Committee, in the days and days hard work it put on the pending bill, was to protect the honest informer. We have reduced from 50 percent to not more than 10 percent the compensation paid under recovery resulting from a suit. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I think, intends to offer an amendment to increase that to 25 percent. I think that is unnecessary. Ten percent is a reasonable compensation when there are billions of dollars involved and there is an alluring prospect of obtaining loot, as I call it, upon the part of some loose lawyer, not bona fide informers at all, but racketeers and blackmailers, if I may say so, for that is exactly what they are, who file these suits and then go to factories and corporations and offer to compromise for a pittance. That is all they expected to get when they filed the suit, and, if that does not smack of blackmail, I do not know what it is. I have heretofore been all over this with Members of the Senate, and we have agreed on practically everything. The honest informer, the bona fide informer, is adequately protected in the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it a fact that the bill was never heard before a subcommittee, or that no hearings were held by the full committee?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is absolutely untrue in its foundation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Some of the leading lawyers of my State have spoken to me about this matter. The Senator speaks of blackmailing lawyers. I do not know anything about blackmailing lawyers in connection with this matter. I do know that some of the leading lawyers in my State regard the whole procedure as an outrage, an attempt to change a practice which has been pursued in good faith under a statute on the books for 80 years. If the Senator knows anything about blackmailing attorneys, he should bring the matter to the attention of the proper authorities.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If I had my full files here, I could cite a dozen cases which smack of blackmail pure and simple.

Answering the Senator's question, there is a man in his State, in St. Louis, by the name of Coates, representing the Coates Manufacturing Co. He discovered that there was what he thought was a case which he should bring under this informer's statute. He appeared before the full committee and testified. That case had been on file for 2 or 3 years. He had spent a considerable amount of money in the prosecution and preparation of the case. Mr. Tom Clark, who is an outstanding, honest public official, was present, and heard the testimony, and he told Mr. Coates that he would not move to dismiss his case, that he could prosecute it to a finish.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me further, I do not know anything about that particular case. This matter was called to my attention primarily as what I regard as a perfectly disgraceful attempt on the part of the Attorney General of the United States—at least a letter was signed in his name, I do not know whether he actually wrote it himself—to interfere in an action in Kansas City which was actually pending, and set for trial, and about to be tried.

If the Senator will permit, I do not know Mr. Clark, but from what I know about him he is an excellent man, and an eminent public servant, but when we leave the matter of prosecuting these cases absolutely to the discretion of a department, it seems to me we are on extremely dangerous ground. Suppose we were to have a situation in this country—which God forbid—like that at the time when Harry Daugherty was Attorney General of the United States, when the Department of Justice was turned over to a lot of thieves. This statute would have been the only means by which the public interest could possibly have been conserved. It seems to me we are treading on dangerous ground in any such proposal.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If the Senator himself had been present during the long and continued hearings, with the representatives of the Department of Justice, and anyone else who wanted to be heard, because we admitted everyone,

I think he would agree with me that the pending bill protects the honest informer as nearly as we can do it by statute.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me it would not make much difference how lengthy the hearings before the committee were, the bill itself is so plainly a move on the part of someone to prevent the prosecution of these cases that it cannot be escaped. Millions and millions of dollars are involved. We hear talk only about the racketeers and informers. We do not hear critical reference to those who are perpetrating frauds on the American people and on the Government of the United States, running up to perhaps billions of dollars. Not one word in condemnation of the extensive fraud being perpetrated in this country has been uttered in behalf of the Senator's committee during this debate. All his criticisms are about the racketeers and the informers. No one here is interested in protecting the racketeers and the informers. The way to get rid of them is for the Attorney General to bring these suits, and it is perfectly proper to provide that no informer should be entitled to institute a suit in the name of the United States Government until after the Attorney General's office has been given full opportunity to bring the suit. But when he fails to bring it, then the private citizen should have the right to come into court on behalf of the people of this country. You are foreclosing citizens from this right by this legislation.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If the Senator will point out where we are foreclosing them—

Mr. MURRAY. You just defeated the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, who is now on the floor.

The Senate in a vote just defeated his amendment, which would have made it possible for a citizen to bring a suit when the Attorney General failed to prosecute.

Mr. VAN NUYS. There is a difference of opinion, and we have spent 2 days arguing it.

Mr. MURRAY. There can be no difference of opinion on that. It is as plain as A B C. It was stated here on the floor by the Senator from Indiana that he thought we should have confidence in the Department of Justice, that we must depend upon the Department of Justice. The present Attorney General is an outstanding citizen, a great lawyer, and we all have every confidence in him, but he has to depend on the advice of hundreds of others in his Department. How can he look into all these cases? And there are hundreds of them. They are occurring every day. This morning I had a clipping which was brought to my attention about a suit brought by the Department of Justice against the National Bronze & Aluminum Co., which describes a fraud which jeopardized the lives of Allied pilots. The accusation was made by the United States attorney, Dan C. Miller, in his statement to a jury of seven men and five women who tried the company and seven of its former officers on a nine-count indictment charging sabo-

tage and conspiracy to defraud the Government in the sale of aluminum castings. Suppose a suit for fraud to recover damages against the company is not instituted by the Department of Justice. Why should it not be possible for some citizen to bring such a suit? The Senator's bill would prevent that from happening.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator is entirely wrong, but I do not intend to go into that again. I have been over it for 2 solid days.

Mr. MURRAY. But the Senator cannot escape that conclusion.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Is that the case of Harsh Bronze Co.?

Mr. MURRAY. The National Bronze & Aluminum Co.

Mr. VAN NUYS. In this case the Government filed its suit 17 minutes after the informer had filed his suit, and the court held that the informer had priority, when he had not done a thing in the case except copy the indictment.

Mr. MURRAY. The pending legislation would protect against that, and I am in favor of the protection of the Government against racketeers. I want that stopped, but I do not want the American people denied the right to come into court with these suits whenever the Attorney General's department refuses to act.

Mr. VAN NUYS. It would not prevent an honest informer from coming in. I hope I will not have to repeat that again. If the Senator from Montana will read the bill he will know I am correct about that.

Mr. MURRAY. I have read the bill and I understand it, and the matter was presented and voted upon here this afternoon. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] offered an amendment which would have made it possible for a private citizen to bring such a suit after the matter had been first brought to the attention of the Attorney General and a suit requested and he had declined to sue. The citizen would have had the right to sue, under the amendment which was proposed by the Senator from West Virginia. That would end the racketeers. The way to get rid of the racketeers is for us to stop these frauds in the United States. Millions of dollars are being stolen from the Government in the war contracts every day. We heard the testimony a few months ago with reference to the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., and the method by which they sought to prevent the Government from detecting their frauds. We learned how they set up a complicated system which prevented the inspectors from discovering the defective wire and cable which was being manufactured for use by the armed forces, the use of which jeopardized the lives of the men at the battle fronts. It seems to me that that kind of fraud is being looked at too lightly by the Congress of the United States. All we are thinking of here is punishing a few racketeers and a few informers, but not one word is being said in condemnation of the most dangerous racketeers there are in the United States, those who would

jeopardize the lives of American boys at the front in order to make illegitimate profits for themselves. All I ask is that the original bill be amended so as to prevent the bringing of these suits until the Attorney General is given an opportunity to sue.

The original act had the approval of Abraham Lincoln. It was put on the statute books for the purpose of preventing frauds in the period during which he was President. The frauds in that period were like petty larceny compared with the frauds which are being committed today. Yet at this time all you can hear of is stopping the informers from bringing these suits in court. You are not thinking about stopping the real frauds. I think it will be found that when this bill is enacted we are going to stop the prosecution of cases which are already pending in court involving millions of dollars, and the perpetrators of these frauds will be given a gift of millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. President, it seems to me we should proceed very carefully with respect to this sort of legislation. It is the most dangerous kind of legislation which we are called on to consider. I submit that the bill should be given very exhaustive consideration before it is finally voted on.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In order to clear up the controversy which has arisen here at this hour, let me submit a question based upon the inquiry made by the Senator from Wisconsin. He propounded this question. Suppose that information should be revealed by the Truman committee of a fraud in connection with a Government contract, and that such information were given to the Attorney General, and the Attorney General in his judgment were to say that he did not desire to proceed in the case, or he did not believe it should be prosecuted. With the bill as it is written could a citizen of the United States proceed in the name of the Government under that state of facts?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Absolutely.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say that I have great respect, of course, for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, but I ask how the individual could do so in view of the following language which has been left in the bill:

No district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it.

In other words, if information were revealed by the Truman committee, and the Attorney General decided not to proceed, no citizen could bring suit, because a citizen could not do so unless he were the original obtainer of the information. That is the question I wish to raise.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Of course, we passed on that point today by a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes, we did.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I respect the views of the Senator from West Virginia. Of course the individual could not bring suit unless he were able to comply with the provisions of the new act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct, and under the provisions of this measure he could not proceed if the information were produced by the Truman committee.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Absolutely. If the Truman committee were in session in this Chamber, and some one were in the Senate gallery listening to the testimony, and rushed out and hired a public stenographer and dictated a bill, and sued some company for a billion dollars, does the Senator from Wisconsin think such procedure would be just and equitable and right and fair to the duly constituted agency of Government, the Department of Justice?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No, I do not; and that I will say is not what could happen, because the person who obtained the information must first give it to the Attorney General, who would have 6 months in which to act upon it.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But, according to the way the bill is now written, if the Attorney General should not act upon the information within 6 months, then the citizen in question could not proceed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I am glad the Senator from West Virginia brought that point up. He speaks of a period of 6 months. I know of a case in which 28 investigators, public accountants, clerks, and lawyers, have worked for 6 months preparing a civil suit. Twenty-eight persons have worked for 6 months to dig out the data necessary in order to bring suit, yet the man who sits in the gallery and listens to testimony could bring suit in 24 hours, and ultimately obtain half a million dollars for himself if a total of a million dollars should be recovered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. With all respect to the Senator from Indiana, I will say that such a person could not bring suit until he himself, under the very terms of this measure, had advised the Attorney General that he had information for the Attorney General, and then he would have to wait 6 months for the Attorney General to act. He could not institute suit in 24 hours after he received the information, because the court could not even hear him until he alleged and showed that 6 months before he brought his suit he went to the Attorney General and told him about the matter.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Let me ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia. A suit was filed only yesterday for \$1,000,000,000 against a railroad and some co-defendants. That suit was filed based on a report of a congressional committee, when the transcript had not even been written. No one aside from the committee knows what the facts are except on the basis of what the newspapers

have said. How long would it take the Department of Justice to examine into the merits of that claim made against the railroad for \$1,000,000,000 damages? It would take more than 6 months.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary complaining about the 6 months' period? I thought that we had all agreed on that.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I am not arguing about that. I would have made the period a year, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Whether the period is 6 months or a year makes no difference to me. What I am saying is that once the Attorney General fails to act there is taken from the citizens of this country the right to act in the name of the Government unless they themselves originally had the information in question.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I think the Senator from West Virginia must agree that the Attorney General should have sufficient time within which to act. We have argued this matter for the last few days.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that the Senator from Indiana does not fully answer the question propounded by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I have tried to do so. I am sorry if I have not succeeded.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from West Virginia has pointed out that under the language of the bill as it now is, the private citizen would be precluded from bringing suit even after the Attorney General had investigated the case and had refused to prosecute for some reason or other. That is exactly what the bill provides as far as I am able to see. The Senator from Indiana does not answer the question asked by the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator from Indiana merely continues to point out that if someone sitting in the gallery overhears testimony revealed in a committee hearing showing that fraud has been committed, he might rush out and file suit immediately. But such action is prevented by the present legislation. Now no suit can be brought until after the matter has been brought to the attention of the Attorney General, and he has been given 6 months' time within which to bring suit. But what we want to see is that the bill shall provide that after he has had that 6 months' time within which to bring suit, and declines to do so, a private citizen can then file suit, and if that private citizen makes a mistake in doing so he shall be held for the cost of the litigation, which in itself would be sufficient to deter him from entering a suit which was not based on real facts.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Let me ask the Senator from Montana a question. Does the Senator favor the old law under which a man can rush in and copy an indictment, and change the caption in the prayer and make a civil suit out of a criminal action, without having any original knowledge at all with respect to the facts in the case? Does the Sen-

ator from Montana favor that sort of thing?

Mr. MURRAY. No, I am opposed to that. Whether the citizen has original knowledge or not, I am opposed to such procedure. I am willing to vote for the provisions of the bill which forbid such action to be taken. But I do not want the bill to be in such form that persons perpetrating frauds on the Government may escape from the responsibility of their fraudulent act merely because the Attorney General fails to bring suit. As was said by the Senator from Missouri a moment ago, let us suppose that we had an Attorney General such as we had some years ago, who, when frauds were being perpetrated right and left, took no action. It seems to me we should have a provision which would be insurance against such frauds being perpetrated. Corporations and individuals who perpetrate fraud can escape being sued by informers and racketeers merely by performing contracts honestly and not undertaken to defraud the Government. It is only those who cheat and defraud the Government who are in danger of being sued by racketeers and informers.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I wonder if the Senator from Montana is familiar with the fact that the Department of Justice has instituted 54 cases since Congress adjourned a couple of months ago?

Mr. MURRAY. Oh, yes; but it is possible that 554 cases could have been instituted.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Upon what foundation of fact does the Senator from Montana make that statement?

Mr. MURRAY. I understand there are 600 investigations on foot, or over 600 cases that are now being investigated. It seems to me there are dozens and dozens of cases which will never be investigated.

Frauds are being committed all over the country. Nothing can be done about many of them by the Attorney General's department because he may not have access to all the facts; he does not have the personnel to take care of the entire situation. As a result, such frauds will be perpetrated, and the perpetrators of them will be getting away with millions of dollars. It seems to me that the protection and insurance the people of the country need is a law which will permit a citizen to file a case when the Attorney General fails to act. If a private citizen files a case which has no merit, he will be held for the costs of the prosecution, which are by no means light, and would be a sufficient deterring force to prevent persons from bringing unnecessary and fruitless suits.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I inquire what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee's first amendment, as amended, extending through line 15 on page 3.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, pending that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Ellender	Murray
Andrews	Ferguson	Overton
Bailey	George	Radcliffe
Ball	Gillette	Reed
Bankhead	Green	Revercomb
Barbour	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Gurney	Robertson
Bridges	Hatch	Scrugham
Buck	Hawkes	Stewart
Burton	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Holman	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Capper	Kilgore	Tunnell
Caraway	Langer	Tydings
Chavez	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Wagner
Connally	McFarland	Wallgren
Danaher	McKellar	Wheeler
Davis	Maloney	White
Downey	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I understand that the pending question is on the first committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I desire to address myself not so much to the amendment as to the subject matter of the bill. It seems to me that what we are doing here is to proceed in an exceedingly hasty and wasteful manner by which we are about to deprive the public of any opportunity whatever of bringing to light and recovering for the Government damages for causes accruing to the Government on which the bureaucrats in the Department of Justice do not see fit to proceed. As I say, I can see that in a situation similar to that which once existed in this country, but which I pray to God may never again exist, although it might exist, as it did when there were a lot of thieves in the Department of Justice in the regime of Harry Daugherty—repeal of the measure might cost the United States untold sums of money.

What is the occasion for the bill? The occasion is that the Department of Justice sought unsuccessfully in the Marcus case to inject itself into private litigation on appeal, and the result was that the Department of Justice was rebuked by the Supreme Court, that the Government collected some fifty-odd thousand dollars in fines on pleas of nolo contendere, and that the private litigation recovered for the Government something more than three times that amount.

The proposed measure, as reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, is intended to allow the Attorney General at his will and in his discretion to abolish all pending causes of action brought by private persons in instances in which the Department of Justice, to use the language of Mr. Justice Black, of the Supreme Court of the United States, has been "tardy"—and "tardy" is the kindest word which can be put upon some of the conduct of the Government—in bringing suits for fraud against the Government. There has been a regular lobby conducted here by the Department of Justice. I do not think anyone questions that. I have been advised by reputable

members of the bar that they never have been given any notice or any opportunity to be heard in opposition to this measure. The statute has been on the books of this country for eight decades. It was originally proposed by no less a person than President Abraham Lincoln. It has been many times construed by the courts. It has been described better than I can describe it by a distinguished Federal court as a remedial statute. In the celebrated Griswold case the court said in speaking of the very statute which it is now sought to repeal:

The statute is a remedial one. It is intended to protect the Treasury against the hungry and unscrupulous host that encompasses it on every side, and should be construed accordingly. It was passed upon the theory, based on experience as old as modern civilization, that one of the least expensive and most effective means of preventing frauds on the Treasury is to make the perpetrators of them liable to actions by private persons, acting, if you please, under the strong stimulus of personal ill will or the hope of gain. Prosecutions conducted by such means—

Said the Court—

compare with the ordinary methods as the enterprising privateer does to the slow-going public vessel.

This statute has been on the books for 80 years. It has always been treated as having been successful. It has always been treated by the courts as a remedial statute. It is only now, when many actions have actually been brought and are pending, that these actions are sought to be abolished by retroactive legislation. I undertake to say that in all except the most unusual and extreme cases, retroactive legislation is always bad legislation.

What is the conduct of the Department of Justice? Let me give one example which has come to my notice. I quote from the court records in this connection. In the so-called Baker-Lockwood case, pending at Kansas City, Mo., there was a so-called informer suit brought by private parties, a civil suit, and also a criminal case. The criminal case was twice continued at the instance of the Government. Then, when the civil suit came on for trial the Attorney General of the United States proceeded to do the absolutely unprecedented, and in my judgment, unjustifiable thing, of writing a private letter to the trial judge, referring to the act the repeal of which is now pending in the United States Senate, and urging the trial judge to continue the civil suit until the cause of action could be abolished by the possible enactment of the proposed statute. Let me read the letter. This is taken from the official records in the case:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 21, 1943.

HON. MERRILL E. OTIS,
United States District Judge,
Kansas City, Mo.

MY DEAR JUDGE OTIS: It was a pleasure to cooperate with you in your request of June 29, 1943, concerning the criminal case of U. S. v. Baker-Lockwood Manufacturing Co. et al. I regret exceedingly that circumstances beyond my control made it impossible to arrange for the appearance of one of the witnesses. Assistant Attorney General Tom C. Clark has discussed with me your order of July 12, 1943, continuing the case

on the defendants' motion, and I can understand that the condition with which you were confronted precluded any other action except to grant some postponement.

A serious problem is created, however, by the circumstance that the civil suit against these defendants relating to the same offense is now set for trial on a date which precedes the trial date of the criminal case.

The Government, which had been a party to the continuance of the criminal case, now asks that the civil suit be postponed until the cause of action can be abolished, as will presently appear.

I have recently received two communications from J. Francis O'Sullivan, Esq., attorney for the plaintiff in the civil suit, and I enclose a copy of his letter of July 16, 1943, for your information.

The civil suit, as you are undoubtedly aware, is not under my control. The statute which gives the right of suit to an informer, in the name of the United States, does not provide for governmental control of that litigation.

Your familiarity with criminal fraud cases is well known to me—

"Lathering" the judge up a little—a compliment, however, which was very justifiable—

and I am sure you can readily appreciate the prejudice that might be caused to a criminal case by a full disclosure of the Government's evidence in a civil case prosecuted by advocates not selected by the Government or charged primarily with the problem of the Government's rights and interests.

Now we come to the milk in the coconut:

The Senate is presently considering House Resolution No. 1203, which provides for the repeal of the statute under which the civil suit was filed. This bill has been passed by the House and has been recommended by the Senate committee. If it becomes law at an early date, which now seems likely, it would appear that the right to maintain the civil suit would be withdrawn from the plaintiff Nathanson.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has conducted the investigation of the facts of this case and it has long been the Department's policy that the results of such investigations are confidential and not available even to congressional committees. Under the circumstances you can readily appreciate that I could not turn over the results of this investigation to Mr. O'Sullivan.

I will appreciate it if you will give consideration to all the facts involved and advise me of your opinion as to whether the ends of justice cannot best be served by a postponement of the civil suit and a stay of the taking of the proposed depositions until after the criminal action has been tried.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Every lawyer in this Chamber, every lawyer everywhere else, and every citizen who is not a lawyer, but who is familiar with the procedure of the courts, knows that if an ordinary lawyer should write such a private letter as that to a competent Federal judge before whom an action was pending, suggesting that the trial of the case then set for trial be postponed until a statute could be enacted to remove the cause of action, that lawyer would land in jail for contempt of court, and would be very lucky if he were not disbarred.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In fairness to the Attorney General, does not the Senator think that the letter of Judge Otis to which this was a response ought also to be read into the record? It seems that the judge had asked the Attorney General—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not find in the Attorney General's letter any reference to a letter from the judge. I am about to read Judge Otis' letter in response to the one which I have read.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Attorney General refers—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Attorney General starts by saying that he is glad to cooperate with the request. It does not appear whether a letter was written to the Attorney General.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was under the impression that the Attorney General had received a letter from the judge.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not so understand. As I understand, a request was made in open court by the Government. I intend to read the letter of Judge Otis in response to the letter of the Attorney General, which I have just read.

The reply is under date of July 29, and reads as follows:

JULY 29, 1943.

HON. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice, Washington,
D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: A few days' absence from Kansas City on official business has delayed an acknowledgment of and reply to your letter of July 21, 1943, concerning the case of *Nathanson v. Baker-Lockwood Manufacturing Company et al.*, and the companion criminal case of *United States v. Baker-Lockwood Manufacturing Company et al.* I was further delayed by the necessity of consulting with counsel in those cases before I could reply to your letter. I just have finished a conference with them.

In your letter you express your reasons for believing that the trial of the case of *Nathanson v. Baker-Lockwood* (an informer suit) should be delayed until after the trial of the case of *United States v. Baker-Lockwood* (a criminal case charging the same facts as are charged in the informer suit).

I agree that the criminal case should be tried first. Whether that now can be done in fairness (you are the last man who would think of asking me to do it otherwise) is a real problem. I read your letter in the conference just held. I said to counsel that I would like very much to comply with your request. I said also, however, that I must be guided in the matter by principles that are applicable generally unless counsel would stipulate that the civil case might be delayed until after the trial of the criminal case. Counsel for Nathanson, Mr. Francis O'Sullivan, was not willing to enter into such an agreement except upon a condition which I shall state hereafter.

Of course, Mr. O'Sullivan would certainly have been exceedingly unmindful of his duty to his client if he had agreed to a continuance in the case after he had been notified, by a letter from the Attorney General to the trial judge, that the Attorney General was simply trying to stall off the trial of the case until the cause of action could be abolished. Any

lawyer who would make such an agreement as that should be disbarred.

Several months ago I announced that the criminal case would be tried in advance of the civil case, provided the criminal case was tried when it was set, unless any delay in the criminal case was not chargeable to the United States. The case was set twice—once for June 21 and then for July 12. It was continued twice. The United States was clearly responsible for both continuances. The first continuance was necessary because of the fact that the United States brought in a new indictment against the defendants just a few days before June 21. The second continuance was made necessary because the United States (not the Department of Justice) made impossible the attendance of certain of defendants' witnesses who, on the allegations set out in the application for a continuance, were essential witnesses.

The United States attorney did not feel that he could agree that the witnesses, if present, would testify in accordance with the statements set out in the applications for a continuance. Probably the United States attorney should not have agreed that they would so testify, but I am not certain that his case would have been jeopardized by that agreement. He did not make the agreement because he did not believe the witnesses would testify as it was said they would. At any rate, it was the action of the United States, the plaintiff in the case, which prevented the trial.

He is speaking now of the criminal case. Having deliberately prevented the trial of the criminal case, the Department of Justice now asks that the rights of the civil litigants acting on behalf of the Government be prejudiced by the postponement of their case until, by a successful lobby in Congress, the Department can get their cause of action abolished.

Judge Otis further wrote:

Since I repeatedly had announced in open court, in the presence of all of the parties, that the civil case would be tried when reached in due course if the criminal case had been delayed through the fault of the United States, you must agree with me that I must keep faith with the parties and give the plaintiff in the civil case an opportunity at least to prove his case. It does not seem to me that as the time set for trial draws near he will be so anxious to proceed as he is now. That, however, is not a matter with which it is my duty to concern myself.

I have said that counsel for Nathanson in open court agreed this morning that he would stipulate that the civil case should be tried after the criminal case on a condition which he stated. It is his contention, and your letter to me confirms it, that it is the hope of the Government that the pending legislation directed against suits of this character will make it impossible for the plaintiff ever to get a trial. It seems that the pending bill contains a provision for the filing of a motion by the Attorney General to stay any civil case of the character here involved.

Counsel for Nathanson agrees to enter into the stipulation I have referred to if the Attorney General will stipulate that in this particular case he will not file such a motion. I do not apprehend at all that you will agree not to file such a motion, but it does seem to me that counsel's proposal is not entirely unfair. Probably counsel ought not to be expected to enter into a stipulation that he will hang himself on a not too distant date.

I have written more fully than probably is justified, but I have done that out of my great respect for you and my most earnest

desire in every proper way to cooperate with you.

I repeat my statement, Mr. President, that it is my opinion—and I think it will be concurred in—that any private lawyer who had written such a letter in an attempt flagrantly to interfere with any litigation would have been put in jail for contempt of court and very likely would have been disbarred. I hold to the old-fashioned view that public officials should adhere to at least as high a standard of decency and fair dealing as should individual practitioners at the bar.

Mr. President, I desire to offer and have pending an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the entire bill. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause as amended, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

That section 3491 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. title 31, sec. 232) be, and it is hereby amended by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"Sec. 3491. (a) In any suit heretofore or hereafter filed under section 3491, if the Attorney General or any district attorney deems it in the public interests so to do, he may file a motion in the court in which any such suit is now or hereafter pending to stay all proceedings therein until after the trial, dismissal, or other disposition of any indictments returned in that, or in any other court of the United States, against any defendant or defendants named in any such suit, and arising out of the transactions involved therein, or any related transactions. If any indictment returned against any such defendant relates to any transaction or transactions involved in said suit, or any transaction related thereto, and impedes or interferes with or may tend to impede or interfere with the prosecution of any such indictments, the court in which any such suit is pending shall thereupon order that all proceedings in said suit and all depositions, interrogatories, or methods of discovery therein, be stayed until after the trial, dismissal, or other disposition of all such indictments returned against any defendant or defendants named in such suit. This act shall not affect or impair the substantive rights of any person who has heretofore filed any such suit for himself as well as for the United States. After the trial, dismissal, or other disposition of indictments against defendants in any such suit, all officers and employees of the Government shall produce any evidence, papers, statements of witnesses, or documents known to them upon subpoena issued in any such suit, or as directed by any order of the court made upon motion after reasonable notice of such motion is given to the Attorney General or district attorney who has filed a motion to stay proceedings."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the effect of the proposed substitute would be to accomplish the announced purpose of the bill as originally proposed; that is to say, it would prevent any one of the plaintiffs in an informer suit from disclosing in the trial of a civil case any information which might be necessary to the Government in the trial of a criminal case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri suspend for a

moment so that the Chair may propound a question? Will the Senator state whether the proposed substitute is offered as a substitute for the entire bill, or for the first committee amendment as amended?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is offered as a substitute for the entire bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If it is offered as a substitute for the entire bill, the pending amendments to amend the original bill take precedence over it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that to be true, Mr. President. I am offering the amendment in the nature of a substitute to have it pending and to be acted upon after the other amendments have been disposed of; but I understand I have a right to offer it and to discuss it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The purpose of the substitute, Mr. President, is to accomplish any remedial purpose which is sought to be accomplished and which has been urged by the Department of Justice in support of the pending bill. It would permit the Department of Justice to have the fullest control over the disclosure of information necessary to the prosecution of criminal suits, and it would prevent the plaintiffs in any of the informer's suits, so-called, from disclosing any information which the Government might not desire to have disclosed. At the same time, however, it would not be retroactive in character, but would permit so-called informer suits to be maintained under proper regulations.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say that there is no justification on earth for the retrospective features of the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. VAN NUYS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Indiana. Has the language in the first section, at the bottom of page 1 and at the top of page 2 of the bill been changed, or does it remain as it was?

Mr. VAN NUYS. No; that is the old statute, simply rephrased.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then the language reading, "within whose jurisdictional limits the person doing or committing such act shall be found"—

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is in the original act.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does that mean that if a man resided in Indiana, for instance, or wherever he might be, and if he could be caught in New York, he could be sued in New York and tried there?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That was the original 1863 statute.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know that, but the Senator is proposing to reenact it.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I agree with the Senator that the man could be tried in New York. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not believe in that. I do not think the Federal courts

or anybody else should exercise jurisdiction except where the act was committed. If the act was committed in Indiana, the defendant should be tried in Indiana. I do not believe there should be a roving court. It seems to me that the jurisdiction should be limited in some way.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The actual working of it, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee, is that 99 percent of the cases are against corporations, as the Senator from Texas might well suppose.

Mr. CONNALLY. They have a situs, though.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The cases can be brought in any State in which the corporations are doing business, wherever they may be found.

Mr. CONNALLY. The provision is that they may be sued wherever they may be found.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes. A corporation found in any Federal district is subject to the Federal court of the district in which it is legally doing business.

Mr. CONNALLY. But the action, by the terms of the statute, is not limited to a corporation. It might be against an individual doing business.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I agree.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think the Federal courts should exercise jurisdiction over a citizen wherever he might be overnight, catch him in New York, and sue him there, when he might live in Indiana, thus entailing a great deal of expense and cost. I shall not offer an amendment, but I just suggest this to the Senator.

Mr. VAN NUYS. In answer to the Senator from Missouri concerning the Baker-Lockwood case, let me read the notation I received from the Department of Justice a day or two ago:

This case in Kansas City involved the bribery of a Government civilian army procurement officer at Wright Field in the purchase of airplane shelters made of canvas.

As I understand, the shelters covered motors used in north Africa, to keep off the sands, and were used in Alaska, with a heater inside, to keep the motors warm, and so on.

Unfortunately, a stenographer in the Justice Department in transmitting a complaint to the United States Attorney at Kansas City failed to enclose a copy with the letter and a Chicago lawyer flew into Kansas City and filed an informer suit 2 or 3 hours before the Government's case was filed.

He having obtained his information in a Chicago newspaper as to what happened.

The lower court dismissed the Government suit and the case was argued in circuit court last week. This is the case—since the recess of Congress the plaintiff in the informer suit has taken a deposition of witnesses appearing before the Grand Jury in our indictment. This has given to the defendants in the indictment most of the evidence of the Government which, of course, will materially affect the prosecution of this case.

I think the point made by the Senator from Missouri about staying of the trial or the taking of depositions in a civil suit until the indictment is prosecuted to

a finish or dismissed is a good suggestion, but as a substitute for the entire bill, after all this work it is almost unthinkable. However, that phase of the motion to substitute is well taken, and I should be glad, if it were offered as an amendment to the bill, to take it to conference.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to vote for any retrospective statute. I am very frank about that. I think that the statute of 1863 is a good law; I think it has been an extremely remedial statute. I think that if there are abuses such as those the Senator from Indiana has outlined, they could be corrected. But what he is doing is to cut the dog's tail off right behind the ears. He is proposing to abolish a remedial statute in order to get rid of some abuses in the matter. It seems to me that the motion to recommit which was voted on awhile ago should have been carried, and after the amendments are disposed of, so far as I am concerned I intend to make another motion to recommit to the committee with instructions to report back by a day certain, which I understand will be in order. I think the bill should go back to the committee, that all these matters brought out in the discussion on the floor should be considered, and that there should be reported by the committee a bill which would preserve the remedial features of the statute without at the same time permitting the abuses to which the Senator from Indiana has referred.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to what has already been discussed. On page 2, beginning in line 10, we find this language:

Provided, That no district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person.

Of course, taken literally, that means that a man could not bring a suit and could not conduct a suit unless all the information originated with himself. To me that is entirely too broad.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, not only must the original information be in possession of the person undertaking to bring the suit but it must be in the possession of the Attorney General.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, the moment the information is given to the Attorney General, he is in possession of it, and no suit can be brought.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Will the Senator from Montana yield in order that I may answer his colleague?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. VAN NUYS. It is evident that the junior Senator from Montana has not followed the course of the pending legislation. This provision has been amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY]. The information which the Attorney General must claim he has

must come from a grand-jury investigation, a congressional-committee investigation, or from some public body, or from a United States Commissioner.

Mr. MURRAY. But I do not think the amendment is sufficient to remedy the situation which will continue to exist. It will be impossible for a private citizen to bring a suit unless the facts are original with him, and, of course, notwithstanding the fact that the Attorney General has the information, he can decline to bring the suit, and then no one can bring suit to protect the interests of the Government.

Mr. WHEELER. I have been out of the Chamber, and I am not familiar with the Danaher amendment. I wanted to clear up that point, because I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that during the Daugherty administration of the Department of Justice I conducted an investigation into that Department. It was found that the Federal Trade Commission had worked up cases of fraud, not one, but hundreds of cases, and had submitted them to the Attorney General of the United States. The Attorney General did nothing about them, except in one or two instances when he might have had it in for someone, but in the great bulk of the cases there was no prosecution of any kind. Clearly, a private person should have been permitted to bring suit in those cases even though he did not work up the evidence himself. Otherwise frauds go unprosecuted, and designing men get away with all kinds of fraud upon the Government, particularly during time of war.

When the present war has ended, it will be found that a great many frauds have been perpetrated upon the Government of the United States, as there were during the last war; indeed, because of the greater magnitude of this war, and the greater expenditure of public money, undoubtedly greater frauds will be perpetrated upon the Government in this war than during the last war. It is almost an impossibility that it be otherwise. Already the Truman committee and others have brought out facts which show that frauds are being committed at the present time.

I might call attention to the fact that a man came to my home this summer, a rancher of my State, a very reputable man, who worked in one of the shipbuilding plants in San Francisco. He said, "If you go to a certain river, you can find that tons and tons of steel are being dumped into that river." That is done because the contractors get contracts with a fixed price, and the price is fixed high, and the contracts are sometimes, in my judgment, carelessly handled by the departments. They say, "We will renegotiate"; but if a man finds he is making a great deal of money, he then wants to make it possible, when the contracts are renegotiated, for him to show that carrying out the contract has cost him a great deal. The same thing occurs in the case of many subcontractors. The contractors let subcontracts to some of their friends and others at very high prices; and when they renegotiate, they can show what they have paid

to the subcontractors. That is one of the things going on in the country with respect to the matter of hoarding of labor.

I may say to the Senate that today, this very noontime, a large and very reputable manufacturer from the State of Ohio came to my office and commented upon what I had said with respect to the hoarding of labor by many war contractors. He said that what I had said with respect to hoarding of labor is exactly what is going on. He gave me illustrations by telling me what is taking place in certain factories in the State of Ohio producing war materials. He said that someone in the Government should check up on the matter of manpower with respect to which we are now scraping the bottom because of the hoarding of labor in many war industries. Hoarding of labor is going on in shipbuilding and in many other industries. That, Mr. President, is one reason why I have advocated postponement of the drafting of fathers. I do not think fathers should be drafted while hoarding of labor is taking place in war industries. Fathers should not be drafted, and thus cause homes to be broken up, while single men are hoarded in war industries.

Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment in an effort to rectify that situation; but until I see the Danaher amendment I shall not offer the amendment I had intended to propose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to hold hearings on it and report it back not later than December 1, 1943.

Mr. HOLMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Moore
Andrews	George	Murray
Bailey	Gillette	Reed
Ball	Green	Revercomb
Bankhead	Guffy	Reynolds
Barbour	Gurney	Robertson
Barkley	Hatch	Stewart
Buck	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Holman	Tunnell
Butler	Kilgore	Tunnell
Capper	Langer	Van Nuys
Caraway	Lucas	Wagner
Chavez	McCarran	Walgren
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Wheeler
Connally	McFarland	White
Danaher	McKellar	Wiley
Eastland	Maloney	Willis
Ellender	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to hold hearings on it and to report it back to the Senate not later than December 1, 1943. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and will vote. I vote "nay".

Mr. WHITE. I announce the following general pairs on this question:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who is detained on official business, with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea." He is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senator are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who has a general pair with the

Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], is detained on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—24

Aiken	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Holman	Robertson
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Capper	Maloney	Wheeler
Chavez	Millikin	White
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Willis

NAYS—30

Andrews	Ellender	McFarland
Bailey	George	McKellar
Bankhead	Gillette	Reed
Barbour	Green	Reynolds
Barkley	Guffey	Stewart
Burton	Gurney	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Hatch	Tunnell
Connally	Hill	Van Nuys
Danaher	Kilgore	Wagner
Eastland	McCarran	Wallgren

NOT VOTING—42

Austin	Hayden	Pepper
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brewster	La Follette	Scruggam
Bridges	Lodge	Shipstead
Brooks	Lucas	Smith
Buck	McNary	Taft
Byrd	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Mead	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Murdock	Truman
Davis	Nye	Tydings
Downey	O'Daniel	Walsh
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Glass	Overtone	Wilson

So the motion of Mr. CLARK of Missouri to recommit with instructions was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, to the first committee amendment, I propose an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, line 14, it is proposed to strike out the word "one-tenth", and to insert the words and figures "25 per centum."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the amendment would make the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 3 read as follows:

In no event shall the amount of such award exceed 25 per centum of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide an inducement to such persons to furnish information upon which frauds of such character can be prosecuted and recoveries made by the United States.

I think the matter has been so fully discussed during the course of today and Wednesday that it is unnecessary for me to say anything further in support of the proposed amendment. It seems to me that the way to prevent any argument about informers being racketeers is to make it possible for suits to be brought and recoveries to be had without the necessity of having private citizens bring suits.

So, under the bill as it should be worded, the Attorney General should have a short period of time—60 days or 6 months or a year, or whatever may be necessary—within which to bring the suit. If he fails to bring the suit within

that time, then any American citizen should be entitled to bring the suit or to furnish to the Attorney General the evidence upon which a suit can be brought; and if he fails to sue, then the suit should be brought by the private citizen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana to the first committee amendment.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, just one word. I know the hour is late, and that Members of the Senate are anxious to have today's session closed, and to get to their homes. I hope the amendment to the amendment will be rejected. I think 10 percent is a very reasonable limit for the compensation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the first committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in the committee amendment as amended, on page 2, line 14, I move to strike out the language "original with such person and", so that the language will read:

That no district court of the United States as hereinbefore set forth shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceedings—

And then go on with Danaher amendment.

If that is done, it seems to me it would eliminate one of the most objectionable features which has been complained of, because then a citizen would not be confined to evidence which was original with him. Certainly, in court, no person should be confined to the proposition that all the evidence must originate with him and that if he obtains evidence from some other source he cannot use it. If that were true in any trial, a great many suits could not be maintained. Certainly a man should be able to use any evidence he can procure, which is not in the possession of the United States, or does not originate from a grand-jury investigation or an investigation by a committee of Congress, or something of that kind. I cannot see any objection to the proposed amendment to the amendment.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Montana what language his amendment covers or would strike out?

Mr. WHEELER. It simply covers the language in line 14, "original with such person and."

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator is moving to strike out that language; is he?

Mr. WHEELER. I am moving to strike it out.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, it is very palpable that the bill will go to conference, and I am willing to accept

the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, then would it not also be necessary to strike out the same language on page 4, in lines 19 and 20?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I think that is true—that in line 20, the words, "original with such person and" should also be stricken out, so as to make the language correspond.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The latter committee amendment is not before the Senate at the present time. The Chair understands that by unanimous consent the proposed amendment to the latter committee amendment may be considered.

Unless there is objection, the question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Montana to strike out from the committee amendment on page 2, lines 14 and 15, the words "original with such person and", and from the committee amendment on page 4, line 20, the words "original with such person and."

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A while ago the Chair stated that the question was on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I read the bill, the whole bill in its present form is a committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Chair understands that the first committee amendment extends through line 15 on page 3. That is all that is before the Senate at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 15, it is proposed to strike out:

Sec. 2. Sections 3493 and 3494 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 234 and 235) are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 17, to insert:

Sec. 2. No district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine any suit pending at the time of the enactment of this act brought under Revised Statutes, section 3491, by any person for himself and the United States over which it would not have jurisdiction if such suit had been brought after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the court in which such suit is pending shall forthwith stay all further proceeding in said suit until the Attorney General shall have 30 days' opportunity to move as hereinafter provided and shall forthwith cause written notice to be given the Attorney General that such suit is pending; and the provision of this section preceding this proviso shall not be applicable

to any such pending suit unless the Attorney General shall within 30 days after receipt of such written notice, move the court to dismiss the suit under this act: *Provided further*, That if after the dismissal under this act of any such pending suit a person having brought such suit makes a full disclosure and request in accordance with the provisions of said section 3491, as amended by section 1 of this act, and the Attorney General declines in writing to comply with such request, or allows 6 months to elapse after such disclosure and request without causing suit to be brought for part or all of the relief requested, such person may bring and carry on a new suit based on the same act, acts, and transactions involved in the suit previously brought if prior to the previous commencement thereof, the information, evidence, and sources upon which such suit was based were original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it. If the previous suit by such person was timely, the time within which such new suit may be commenced by such person shall not expire until 8 months after the date of the enactment of this act, or until the expiration of the time provided by section 3494 of the Revised Statutes, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That the Attorney General may cause a suit to be brought based in whole or in part upon the act, acts, or transactions involved in such pending suit previously brought by such person either after receipt of such disclosure and request or otherwise. If the previous suit brought by such person was timely, the period within which the Attorney General may cause a suit to be brought based in whole or in part on the same act, acts, or transactions shall not expire until 8 months after the date of the enactment of this act, or until the expiration of the time provided by section 3494 of the Revised Statutes, whichever is later.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 5, line 7, in the committee amendment, after the word "otherwise." I offer the same amendment which I proposed yesterday, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 7, in the committee amendment, after the word "otherwise," it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the following: "and, if such suit brought by the Attorney General is based in whole or in part upon original information, evidence, or sources furnished or obtained through such pending suit or by the plaintiff in such pending suit, the court may, upon application made by such plaintiff, award to him, out of the proceeds of the suit brought by the Attorney General or any settlement of any claim involved therein, an amount, not in excess of one-tenth of the proceeds or settlement, which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such plaintiff."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to explain the amendment. If the Attorney General takes over a suit which is already pending, this amendment would permit the court to allow a reasonable fee, up to 10 percent, to the plaintiff who had started the case. It would be the same as though he had given the evidence and an original case

had been initiated by the Attorney General.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. I am very glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment on page 5, line 7.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 13, to insert:

Sec. 3. Nothing in this act shall affect any such suit which was filed prior to June 15, 1942, or in which a final judgment has heretofore been entered, whether or not the cause be pending on review in an appellate court.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for section 3 in the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to substitute for section 3 in the committee amendment the following:

The act shall not apply to any suit filed prior to the effective date hereof: *Provided, however*, If the Attorney General deems it in the public interests, he may cause to be filed or file a motion in the court in which any such suit is now or hereafter pending to stay all proceedings therein until after the trial of any indictments returned in that, or in any other court of the United States, against any defendant or defendants named in any such suit, and arising out of the transactions involved therein or any related transactions. If the court finds that any indictment returned against any such defendant relates to any transaction or transactions involved in said suit, or in any transaction related thereto, and that any proceedings which might be taken in said case impedes or interferes with or may tend to impede or interfere with the prosecution of any such indictments, such court shall thereupon order that all proceedings in said cause and all depositions, interrogatories, or methods of discovery be stayed until after the trial of all such indictments returned against any defendant or defendants named in such suit. This act shall not affect or impair the substantive rights of any person who has heretofore filed any such suit for himself as well as for the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this substitute for section 3 would accomplish essentially the same purpose which was intended by the substitute for the whole bill which I sent forward a little while ago, and which has not as yet been acted upon. The substitute for section 3 would fully protect the Government in its right to protect itself against the disclosure or use of information which the Government does not desire to have prematurely disclosed or used in a civil suit, a so-called informer suit. At the same time, it would do away with the retroactive feature of the committee amendment, and preserve the rights of everyone. It would permit a stay at the instance of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in the nature of a substitute for section 3 in the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Millikin
Andrews	Gillette	Murray
Ball	Green	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Revercomb
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Robertson
Burton	Hawkes	Stewart
Butler	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Holman	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Chavez	Kilgore	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Van Nuys
Connally	Lucas	Wagner
Danaher	McCarran	Wallgren
Eastland	McClellan	Wheeler
Ellender	McFarland	Wiley
Ferguson	McKellar	Willis
	Maloney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in the nature of a substitute for section 3 in the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida

[Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Maryland.

Mr. FERGUSON. I announce the following general pairs on this question:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; and

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who is detained on official business, with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], if present would vote "yea." He is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent as members of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. He is detained on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily detained.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—16		
Aiken	Gillette	Robertson
Ball	Holman	Vandenberg
Capper	Langer	Wheeler
Chavez	Millikin	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Murray	
Eastland	Revercomb	

NAYS—37		
Andrews	Green	Maloney
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Barbour	Hatch	Stewart
Barkley	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Caraway	Kilgore	Van Nuys
Connally	Lucas	Wagner
Danaher	McCarran	Wallgren
Ellender	McClellan	Wiley
Ferguson	McFarland	
George	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—43		
Austin	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Brewster	Lodge	Smith
Bridges	McNary	Taft
Brooks	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Mead	Tobey
Bushfield	Moore	Truman
Byrd	Murdoch	Tydings
Chandler	Nye	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	Wherry
Davis	O'Mahoney	White
Downey	Overtton	Wilson
Gerry	Pepper	
Glass	Radcliffe	

So the amendment of Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the nature of a substitute for section 3 was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the third committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I call up the substitute for the entire bill which I offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] as a substitute for the bill, as amended.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. The bill (H. R. 1203) was passed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I move that the title be amended to read as follows:

A bill to limit private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate for a moment. It is the purpose of the Senator from Montana to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill to defer the drafting of fathers—the Wheeler bill. I have no objection to the motion being agreed to so far as making the bill the unfinished business is concerned. It is my purpose to move that the Senate recess until next Tuesday. It is understood that General Marshall, who has been called on an important mission to Mexico City, will return to Washington tomorrow night, and will be here Monday to testify before the Committee on Military Affairs on the subject of the bill.

The Senator from Montana has agreed—and I think properly so—that the bill should not be considered until General Marshall has had an opportunity to testify before the committee.

It is my hope that we may take the Wheeler bill up Tuesday and dispose of it, but I wish to state that it is desirable that the hearings which have been held before the Committee on Military Affairs, and those which will be held on Monday, shall be printed and made available to all Senators. I have conferred with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], who has ordered that the hearings be printed as soon as it is possible to get the transcript to the Printing Office. While it is the purpose to make the bill the unfinished business and to go over until Tuesday,

if by any chance the hearings should not be available Tuesday, I would feel that we should then let the bill go over until Wednesday, until we can obtain the hearings, because manifestly all Members of the Senate could not attend the hearings. Some of us who were not members of the committee did attend, but it is extremely desirable that Senators be permitted to read the hearings and get the viewpoint of those who expressed themselves.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not perfectly obvious that if General Marshall is not to testify until Monday, the printed hearings cannot be available Tuesday?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; that is not obvious, because the hearings have been closed already, with the exception of the testimony of General Marshall, and the testimony taken so far has been ordered printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am speaking of General Marshall's testimony.

Mr. BARKLEY. The chairman of the committee advises me that he thinks it entirely feasible to have General Marshall's testimony ready by Tuesday.

Mr. WHEELER. If for any reason the hearings are not ready by Tuesday, I shall be willing to let the bill go over until Wednesday, but I do want it made the unfinished business.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 763.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now the unfinished business of the Senate.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. There being no Executive Calendar, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, September 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, teach us that as our faith is inspired and sustained by the redeeming love of Thy Son, remaining strong and loyal, "we are more than conquerors." We pray that the present eclipse may purge our vision, widen our sky, and increase our power; thus in Thee we shall know the truth and force of right and learn to deaden the love of self. Keep our minds attentive by sincerity of spirit and integrity of life; thus

we shall help to turn wicked shadows into Thy righteous morning.

Send us forth to our problems with open and unbiased minds, realizing that we must identify ourselves with the suffering and perishing races of earth and that immortal badges are won only on the field of self-sacrifice. Do Thou deliver our country from false teachers who through ignorance, prejudice, or conceit mislead the unwary to make shipwreck of faith. Never before was it greater folly to be skeptical about Divine guidance in the long purpose of humanity. Great God, in the midst of all, lead us to light the candle rather than curse the darkness. Help those who are in spiritual need; open our eyes that with expanding vision we may see the clouds of war becoming the chariots of the Most High breaking over the mountains. And Thine shall be the praise. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 14, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2912) entitled "An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BAILEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 180):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

PARTICIPATION IN WORLD PEACE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on a motion to suspend the rules and pass House Concurrent Resolution 25 be extended to 4 hours, such time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and that said motion to suspend the rules shall be the continuing order of business of the House until finally disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. DAY objected. The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

HON. SAM RAYBURN, THE SPEAKER

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the third anniversary of the term as Speaker of the gentleman from Texas, Hon. SAM RAYBURN. As chairman of the Texas delegation and by their direction and in their behalf, I extend to him not only the hearty congratulations of the delegation from his own State, but of all the people of Texas, and I have an idea that I also express the sentiments of this House, regardless of political or party affiliations.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Texas is certainly expressing the sentiment of the Members on this side of the House. We all admire and respect our good Speaker for his high purpose and integrity. We extend our sincere felicitations.

Mr. THOMASON. I am very sure that is correct, and I know that the Members on both sides thoroughly appreciate the attitude of the minority leader. I know the warm friendship and mutual admiration that exists between the Speaker and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the distinguished Speaker is the son of Texas, but his strong character, constructive contributions, and his unusual ability have lifted him above State environment and State associations into varied fields, and he is now considered the son of all of the States of the Union.

Mr. THOMASON. SAM RAYBURN belongs to the Nation. No man can be a Member of this body for 34 years and not possess high character and unusual ability. To become Speaker he must also have capacity for leadership, which Speaker RAYBURN has proved he has in a marked degree.

I feel confident in expressing the thought that the present Speaker of the House will rank with the great Speakers of this body. I am sure that I voice the sentiment of the House, not only in extending its congratulations on his outstanding record as Speaker and his fairness to every Member of the House on all occasions, but I also voice its sentiment in wishing for him long life and much happiness.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 272)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

During the 2 months' recess of the Congress, many important events have occurred at the war fronts and at home. You return at a time when major battles in Europe and in Asia are beginning to be joined. In recent months, the main tides of conflict have been running our way—but we could not and cannot be content merely to drift with this favorable tide.

You know from the news of the past few days that every military operation entails a legitimate military risk and that occasionally we have checks to our plans—checks which necessarily involve severe losses of men and materials.

The Allied forces are now engaged in a very hard battle south of Naples. Casualties are heavy. The desperation with which the Germans are fighting reveals that they are well aware of the consequences to them of our occupation of Italy.

The Congress and the American people can rest assured that the landing on Italy is not the only landing we have in mind. That landing was planned at Casablanca. At Quebec, the leaders and the military staffs of Great Britain and the United States made specific and precise plans to bring to bear further blows of equal or greater importance against Germany and Japan—with definite times and places for other landings on the continent of Europe and elsewhere.

On the 10th of July a carefully prepared expedition landed in Sicily. In spite of heavy German opposition it cleared this large and heavily fortified island in 38 days.

British, Canadian, and American losses in killed, wounded, and missing in the Sicilian campaign were 31,158, of which the American forces lost 7,445. The casualties among the Italians and Germans were approximately 165,000, including 132,000 prisoners.

The unmistakably sincere welcome given to the Allied troops by the Italian people has proved conclusively that even in a country which had lived for a generation under a complete dictatorship—with all of its propaganda, censorship, and suppression of free speech and discussion—the love of liberty was unquenchable.

It has also proved conclusively that this war was not waged by the people of Italy on their own choice. All of Mussolini's propaganda machine could not make them love Hitler or hate us. The less said about the feelings toward Mussolini the better.

I believe that equal jubilation and enthusiasm will be shown by the people of the other nations now under the German heel when Nazi gauleiters and native Quislings are removed through force or flight.

How different was this invading army of the Allies from the German forces that had come into Sicily, ostensibly to "protect it." Food, clothing, cattle, medicines and household goods had been systematically stolen from the people of Sicily, and sent North to the "master race" in Germany. Sicily, like other parts of Italy and like the other satellite

and conquered nations, had been bled white by the Nazi and Fascist governments. Growers of crops were permitted to retain only a small fraction of their own produce for themselves and their families.

With the Allied armies, however, went a carefully planned organization, trained and equipped to give physical care to the local population—food, clothing, medicine. This new organization is also now in the process of restoring to the people of Sicily freedoms which for many years had been denied to them. I am confident that within a year Sicily will be once more self-supporting—and, in addition to that, once more self-respecting.

From Sicily the advance of the Allied armies has continued to the mainland. On the 3d day of September they landed on the toe of the Italian peninsula. These were the first Allied troops to invade the continent of Europe in order to liberate the conquered and oppressed countries. History will always remember this day as the beginning of the answer to the prayer of the millions of liberty-loving human beings, not only in these conquered lands but all over the world.

On July 25—2 weeks after our first landings in Sicily—political events in Italy startled the world. Mussolini, the incubus of Italy for a generation, the man who is more responsible for all the sorrows of Italy than anyone, except possibly Hitler himself, was forced out of office and stripped of his power as a result of his own dismal failures, his wanton brutalities, and the overwhelming demand of the Italian people. This was the first break in Axis leadership—to be followed, we are determined, by other and similar encouraging downfalls.

But there is one thing I want to make perfectly clear: When Hitler and the Nazis go out, the Prussian military clique must go with them. The war-breeding gangs of militarists must be rooted out of Germany—and out of Japan—if we are to have any real assurance of future peace.

Early last month the relentless application of overwhelming Allied power—particularly air and sea power—convinced the leaders of Italy that it could not continue an active part in the war. Conversations were begun by them with us. These conversations were carried on with the utmost secrecy. Therefore, much as I wished to do so, I could not communicate the facts of the case to the Congress, or the press, or to those who repeatedly expressed dismay or indignation at our apparent course in Italy. These negotiations turned out to be a complete surprise to nearly everyone, not only to the Axis but to the Italian people themselves.

I am sure that the Congress realizes that there are many situations in this war—and there will be many more to come—in which it is impossible for me to make any announcement or even to give any indication of the policy which we are following. And I ask the American people, as well as the Congress, to bear with me and with our Chiefs of Staff. It is difficult to remain silent

when unjustified attack and criticism come from those who are not in a position to have all the facts.

But the people and the Congress can be sure that the policy which we follow is an expression of the basic democratic traditions and ideals of this Republic. We shall not be able to claim that we have gained total victory in this war if any vestige of fascism in any of its malignant forms is permitted to survive anywhere in the world.

The armistice with Italy was signed on September 3 in Sicily, but it could not be put into effect until September 8, when we were ready to make landings in force in the Naples area. We had planned these landings some time before and were determined to go through with them, armistice or no armistice.

Italian leaders appealed to their Army and Navy to end hostilities against us. Italian soldiers, though disorganized and ill-supplied, have been fighting the Germans in many regions. In conformity with the terms of unconditional surrender, the Italian Fleet has come over to our side; and it can be a powerful weapon in striking at the Nazi enemies of the Italian people.

When Hitler was forced to the conclusion that his offensive was broken, and he must go on the defensive, he started boasting that he had converted Europe into an impregnable fortress. But he neglected to provide that fortress with a roof. He also left various other vulnerable spots in the wall of the so-called fortress—which we shall point out to him in due time.

The British and American air forces have been bombing the roofless fortress with ever-increasing effectiveness. It is now our purpose to establish bases within bombing range of southern and eastern Germany, and to bring devastating war home to these places by day and by night as it has already been brought to western Germany.

When Britain was being subjected to mass bombing in 1940 and 1941—when the British people, including their King and Prime Minister, were proving that Britain "could take it"—the strategists of the Royal Air Force and of our own Army Air Forces were not idle. They were studying the mistakes that Goering and his staff of Nazi terrorists were making. Those were fatal mistakes, as it turned out.

Today, we and the British are not making those mistakes. We are not bombing tenements for the sheer sadistic pleasure of killing, as the Nazis did. We are striking devastating blows at carefully selected, clearly identified strategic objectives—factories, shipyards, munition dumps, transportation facilities, which make it possible for the Nazis to wage war. And we are hitting these military targets and blowing them to bits.

German power can still do us great injury. But that evil power is being destroyed, surely, inexorably, day by day, and if Hitler does not know it by now, then the last trace of sanity has departed from that distorted mind.

We must remember that in any great air attack the British and Americans lose

a fairly high proportion of planes and that these losses must be made up quickly so that the weight of the bombing shall not decrease for a day in the future. In fact, a high rate of increase must be maintained according to plan—and that means constant stepping up of our production here at home.

In the remarkable raid on the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania we lost 53 of our heavy bombers, and more than 500 of our finest men are missing. This may seem like a disastrously high loss, unless you figure it against the damage done to the enemy's war power. I am certain that the German or the Japanese high commands would cheerfully sacrifice tens of thousands of men to do the same amount of damage to us, if they could. Those gallant and brilliant young Americans who raided Ploesti won a smashing victory which, I believe, will contribute materially to the shortening of the war and thus save countless lives.

We shall continue to make such raids all over the territory of Germany and the satellite countries. With Italy in our hands, the distances we have to travel will be far less and the risks proportionately reduced.

We have reliable information that there is definite unrest and a growing desire for peace among the peoples of these satellite countries—Rumania, Hungary, Finland, and Bulgaria. We hope that in these nations the spirit of revolt against Nazi dominance which commenced in Italy will burst into flame and become a consuming fire.

Every American is thrilled by the sledge-hammer blows delivered against the Nazi aggressors by the Russian armies. This summer there has been no successful German advance against the Russians, as in 1941 and 1942. The shoe today is on the other foot—and is pinching very hard. Instead, the Russians have forced the greatest military reversal since Napoleon's retreat in 1812.

The recapture of Kharkov, Stalino, and other strongholds by the Russians, the opening of the Ukraine and the Donets Basin and the freeing of millions of valuable acres and hundreds of inhabited places hearten the whole world as the Russian campaign moves toward the elimination of every German from Russian soil—toward the invasion of Germany itself. It is certain that the campaign in north Africa, the occupation of Sicily, the fighting in Italy, and the compelling of large numbers of German planes to go into combat in the skies over Holland, Belgium, and France by reason of our air attacks, have given important help to the Russian Armies along their advancing front from Leningrad to the Black Sea. We know, too, that we are contributing to that advance by making Germany keep many divisions in the Balkans, in southern France, and along the English Channel. I like to think that these words constitute an understatement.

Similarly, the events in the Mediterranean have a direct bearing upon the war against Japan.

When the American and British expeditionary forces first landed in north

Africa last November, some people believed that we were neglecting our obligations to prosecute the war vigorously in the Pacific. Such people continually make the mistake of trying to divide the war into several watertight compartments—the western European front, the Russian front, the Burma front, the New Guinea and Solomons front, and so forth—as though all of these fronts were separate and unrelated to each other. You even hear talk of the air war as opposed to the land war or the sea war.

Actually, we cannot think of this as several wars. It is all one war, and it must be governed by one basic strategy.

The freeing of the Mediterranean, which we started last fall, will lead directly to the resumption of our complete control of the waters of the eastern Indian Ocean and the Bay of Bengal. Thus, we shall be enabled to strike the Japanese on another of their highly vulnerable flanks.

As long as Italy remained in the war as our enemy—as long as the Italian fleet remained in being as a threat—a substantial part of British naval strength had to be kept locked up in the Mediterranean. Now, that formidable strength is freed to proceed eastward to join in the ever-increasing attack upon the Japanese. It has not been sufficiently emphasized that the freeing of the Mediterranean is a great asset to the war in the Far East.

There has been one serious gap in the lines of our globe-girdling sea power. That is the gap between northwest Australia and Ceylon. That gap can now be closed as a result of victory in the Mediterranean.

We face, in the Orient, a long and difficult fight. We must be prepared for heavy losses in winning that fight. The power of Japan will not collapse until it has been literally pounded into the dust. It would be the utmost folly for us to try to pretend otherwise.

Even so, if the future is tough for us, think what it is for General Tojo and his murderous gang. They may look to the north, to the south, to the east, or to the west. They can see closing in on them, from all directions, the forces of retribution under the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz, and Admiral Lord Mountbatten.

The forces operating against Japan in the various Pacific theaters are just as much interrelated and dependent on each other as are the forces pounding against Germany in Europe.

With the new threats that we offer from the Aleutians, Japan cannot afford to devote as large a proportion of her forces to hold the lines in other areas.

Such actions as the taking of Attu and Kiska do not just happen. They are the results of careful and complete planning which was going on quietly while some of our critics were so perturbed that they had reached the verge of tears over what they called the threatened invasion of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. It was difficult for them to realize that the carefully prepared and crucial tests in the Coral Sea and at

Midway and in the Solomons rendered the Japanese toehold in the Aleutians untenable.

Japan has been hard put to it to maintain her extended lines. She had to withdraw her garrison from Kiska in the face of the oncoming American-Canadian forces because she could not maintain a steady stream of adequate reinforcements and supplies to the Aleutians.

In the Solomon Islands, with heavy fighting, we have gained so many island air bases that the threat to Australia and New Zealand across the Coral Sea has been practically dissipated. In fact, it is safe to say that our position in that area has become a threat on our part against the Japanese in the seas that lie north of the Solomons and north of New Guinea.

American, Australian, New Zealand, and Dutch forces in a magnificent campaign in New Guinea and the Solomons have destroyed much Japanese strength and have gained for us new bases from which to launch new offensive operations.

After a long period of defensive strategy in Burma, we are determined to take the offensive there. I am also glad to report to you that we are getting more supplies and military help to China. Almost every day word comes that a new air battle has destroyed two and three times more Japanese planes in China and Burma than we ourselves have lost. That process will continue until we are ready to strike right at the heart of Japan itself.

It goes almost without saying that when Japan surrenders the United Nations will never again let her have authority over the islands which were mandated to her by the League of Nations. Japan obviously is not to be trusted. And the same thing holds good in the case of the vast territories which Japan has stolen from China starting long before this war began.

Since the beginning of our entrance into the war, nearly 2 years ago, the United Nations have continuously reduced enemy strength by a process of attrition. That means, cold-bloodedly, placing the ever-increasing resources of the Allies into deadly competition with the ever-decreasing resources of the Axis. It means the training and use of the Allied manpower—which is greater than the Axis. It means the use of our superior facilities and ability to make more munitions and, above all, aircraft, more quickly than our enemies can do.

For example, the Allies today on the European front have a definite superiority in almost all weapons of war on any and every point of the encircling line—more guns, more tanks, more planes, more trucks, more transports, more supply ships, and more warships.

In the Pacific we have taken a steady toll of Japanese war planes and a steady toll of Japanese ships—merchant ships and naval vessels. The odds are all in our favor, for we grow in strength, and they cannot even replace all their losses. It might be called a simple mathematical progression.

However, unless we keep up and increase the tempo of our present rate of production, this greater strength in planes and guns, tanks and ships, can all be lost.

Our great production program started during the darkest days of 1940. With the magnificent contribution made by American industry and American labor, it is approaching full production. Britain has already attained full production. Today, the British Empire and the United States together are turning out so much of every essential of war that we have definite superiority over Germany and Japan, which is growing with every succeeding minute. But we have no minutes to lose.

Realization of the distances we must cover brings to mind problems that every American should realize—problems of transporting from our shores to the actual fighting areas the weapons and munitions of war which we make. Burma and China can be reached only with extraordinary difficulty. Two years ago, most of the planes we sent had to be knocked down, crated, put on board ship, transported, then uncrated and put together again in India, and from there sent up to the fighting front.

In the case of China, they had to be flown over enormous mountains. Even after they were safely delivered there, the planes had to be kept supplied with ground crews, tools, oil, gasoline, and even spare parts. Since the Japs cut the Burma Road, all these supplies have to be flown over hundreds of miles to bases which had to be built in China.

The same slow process was also the rule in the southwest Pacific.

With the present increased range of airplanes and the establishment of additional bases, we are now flying more of them under their own power than before, but all the things that go to supply them—the gasoline, the tools, the spare parts—still have to be taken by ship to the fighting fronts all over the world. Practically every soldier and all his weapons and equipment have to go by ship. And every time a new forward move develops the whole outfit has to go by ship.

I wonder how many people realize what it means to carry on the war across the Atlantic and the Pacific and through the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, along lines of supply attacked by submarines and dive bombers at many points.

The combined operation of the British and Americans last November against Morocco and Algeria was in point of numbers the largest military movement over the longest number of miles to landings under fire that history has recorded anywhere.

The ships for such an amphibious operation cannot be loaded in the ordinary way, to be unloaded alongside a comfortable, safe wharf. Most of the ships must be "combat loaded" in such a way that the troops go ashore first and are immediately followed in the proper order by guns and ammunition, tanks, trucks, and food, medical equipment and all the supplies of a modern army. Prepara-

tions must be made to conduct these landings under enemy fire, and on beaches instead of at docks. People who have seen or planned this kind of operation even over short distances do not speak glibly about landing great expeditions on a few days' notice or on all the beaches of Europe at the same time.

The Members of the Congress have undoubtedly had an opportunity to see at first hand in their own home districts some of our war factories and plants and shipyards throughout the United States which are now working at full blast turning out the greatest amount of war production in the history of the world.

In June and July we were worried by a reduction in the rate of increase in production. Great as our production had been we could not afford to level off. We had to continue the upward curve and not pause on any plateaus.

I am happy to report that the increase was resumed in August. In this month of September it is even better.

For example, during the 2 months of the recess of the Congress our factories produced approximately 15,000 planes. There was an especially important increase in the production of heavy bombers in August. I cannot reveal the exact figures on this. They would give the enemy needed information—but no comfort. However, the total airplane production is still not good enough. We seek not only to come up to the schedule but to surpass it.

During those same 2 months American shipyards put into commission 3,200,000 tons of large merchant ships—a total of 281 ships, almost 5 ships a day.

Even as the actual fighting engagements in which our troops take part increase in number, it is becoming more and more evident that this is essentially a great war of production. The best way to avoid heavy casualty lists is to provide our troops with the best equipment possible—and plenty of it.

We have come a great way since this Congress first met in January of this year. But I state only a blunt fact when I tell the Congress that we are still a long, long way from ultimate victory in any major theater of the war.

First. Despite our substantial victories in the Mediterranean, we face a hard and costly fight up through Italy—and a major job of organizing our positions before we can take advantage of them.

Second. From bases in the British Isles we must be sure that we have assembled the strength to strike not just in one direction but in many directions—by land and sea and in the air—with overwhelming forces and equipment.

Third. Although our Russian allies have made a magnificent counteroffensive, and are driving our common enemies back day by day, the Russian Armies still have far to go before they get into Germany itself.

Fourth. The Japanese hold firmly established positions on an enormous front from the Kuriles through the mandated islands to the Solomons and through the Netherlands East Indies to Malaysia and Burma and China. To

break through this defensive ring we must hit them and hit them hard not merely at one point but at many points, and we must keep on hitting them.

In all of history, there has never been a task so tremendous as that which we now face. We can do it—and we will do it—but we must plan and work and fight with every ounce of intelligence and energy and courage that we possess.

The Congress has reconvened at a time when we are in the midst of the Third War Loan Drive seeking to raise a sum unparalleled in history—\$15,000,000,000. This is a dramatic example of the scale on which this war still has to be fought, and presents some idea of how difficult and costly the responsible leaders of this Government believe the war will be.

Nothing we can do will be more costly in lives than to adopt the attitude that the war has been won—or nearly won. That would mean a let-down in the great tempo of production which we have reached, and would mean that our men who are now fighting all over the world will not have that overwhelming superiority of power which has dealt so much death and destruction to the enemy and at the same time has saved so many American lives.

That is why I have always maintained that there is no such separate entity as the home front. Every day lost in turning out an airplane or a ship at home will have its direct effect upon the men now battling up the leg of Italy or in the jungles of the southwest Pacific or in the clouds over China.

There have been complaints from some sources about the way this production and other domestic activities have been carried on. Some of these complaints of course are justified. On the other hand some of them come from selfish people who merely do not like to give up some of their pleasures, or a part of their butter or meat or milk.

Fair-minded citizens, however, will realize that although mistakes have been made, the job that has been done in converting peacetime America to a wartime basis has been a great job and a successful one, of which all our people have good reason to be proud.

It would be nothing short of a miracle if this unprecedented job of transforming a peace-loving, unprepared industrial America into a fighting and production machine had been accomplished without some mistakes being made and some people being given cause for complaint.

The Congress is well aware of the magnitude of the undertaking, and of the many gigantic problems involved. For the Congress has been actively involved in helping to work out the solutions to these unprecedented problems.

A few facts will show how vast an enterprise this war has been—and how we are constantly increasing the tempo of our production.

The total amount spent on the war from May 1940 to date is \$128,123,000,000. The bill is now running at the rate of \$250,000,000 per day.

Up to September 1, 1943, among the more important items produced and delivered since the armament program started in May 1940 are the following:

Airplanes.....	123,000
Airplane engines.....	349,000
Tanks.....	53,000
Artillery weapons.....	93,000
Small arms (rifles, carbines, machine guns, etc.).....	9,500,000
Small arms ammunition, rounds.....	25,942,000,000
Trucks.....	1,233,000

In most instances more than half of the above total delivered to date was produced during the first 8 months of 1943:

Airplanes.....	52,000
Tanks.....	23,000
Artillery weapons.....	40,600
Small arms (rifles, carbines, machine guns, etc.).....	4,638,000
Small arms ammunition, rounds.....	13,339,000,000

The number of fighting ships and auxiliaries of all kinds completed since May 1940 is 2,380 and 13,000 landing vessels.

In the 2½ years between January 1, 1941 and July 1, 1943, the power plants built for installation in Navy vessels had a horsepower equal to all the horsepower of all hydroelectric plants in the United States in January 1941.

The completions of Navy ships during the last 6 months were equal to completions in the entire year of 1942.

We have cut down the time required to build submarines by almost 50 percent.

The antiaircraft and double-purpose guns produced by the Navy since the defense program started in May 1940, if fired altogether, would throw 4,600 tons of projectiles per minute against the enemy.

The output of under-water ordnance—torpedoes, mines, and depth charges—during the first half of 1943 was equal to the total production of 1942.

During the month of August 1943 we produced almost as many torpedoes as during all of World War I.

Anyone who has had to build a single factory, tool it up, get the necessary help, set up an assembly line, produce and ship the product will have some idea of what that amount of production has meant.

We have had to raise and equip armed forces approaching 10,000,000 men. Simultaneously, in spite of this drain on our manpower, we have had to find millions more men and millions of women to operate our war factories, arsenals, shipyards, essential civilian industries—and the farms and mines of America.

There have been the problems of increasing greatly the output of our natural resources—not only for our own Army and Navy and for our civilians at home, but also for our allies and our own forces all over the world.

Since the outbreak of war in Europe, we have increased our output of petroleum by 63 percent. We have stepped up our bituminous coal production by 40 percent; chemicals by 300 percent; iron ore by 125 percent; hydroelectric power by 79 percent; and steel by 106 percent.

There were the problems of raising and distributing more food than ever before in our history—for our armed

services, for our own people, and to help feed our allies.

There was the formidable problem of establishing a rationing system of the necessities of life which would be fair to all of our people.

There was the difficulty of keeping prices from skyrocketing and fighting off the serious specter of inflation.

There was the problem of transporting millions of men and hundreds of millions of tons of weapons and supplies all over our own country and also to all corners of the world. This necessitated the largest railroad and shipping operations in all history.

There were the problems involved in our vast purchases in foreign countries; in our control of foreign funds, located in this country; in our custody of alien property; in our occupation of liberated areas. There were new problems of communications, of censorship, of war information.

There was the problem of maintaining proper management-labor relations; of fair treatment and just compensation to our millions of war workers; of avoiding strikes; of preventing the exploitation of workers or natural resources by those who would seek to become war profiteers and war millionaires.

There were the problems of civilian defense, of lend-lease, of subcontracting war contracts to smaller businesses, of building up stock piles of strategic material whose normal sources have been seized by the enemy—such as rubber and tin.

There was the problem of providing housing for millions of new war workers all over the country.

And touching all of these, there was the great problem of raising the money to pay for all of them.

No sincere, sensible person doubts that in such an unprecedented, breath-taking enterprise errors of honest judgment were bound to creep in, and that occasional disputes among conscientious officials were bound to occur. And if anyone thinks that we, working under our democratic system, have made major mistakes in this war, he should take a look at some of the blunders made by our enemies in the so-called efficient dictatorships.

Even sincere, sensible people sometimes fail to compare the handfuls of errors or disputes on the one hand, with the billions of instances where the agencies of government in cooperation with each other have moved with the precision of a smoothly working machine.

Some people, when a doughnut is placed before them, claim they can see only the hole in it. Sometimes this is an example of sheer individual pessimism; but sometimes it is caused by motives not consonant with war-winning ideals.

The American people as a whole, however, are fair-minded. They have learned to distinguish between the sensational and the factual. They know that there is no so-called news when things run right. They know, for example, that a few newspapers and columnists and radio commentators can

make controversy create "news" which is eagerly sought by Axis propagandists in their evil work.

Obviously, we never could have produced and shipped as much as we have, we could not now be in the position we now occupy in the Mediterranean, in Italy, or in the southwest Pacific, or on the Atlantic convoy routes, or in the air over Germany and France, if conditions in Washington and throughout the Nation were as confused and chaotic as some people try to paint them.

We know that in any large private industrial plant doing a thousandth part of what their Government in Washington is doing there are also occasional mistakes and arguments. But this is not a good comparison. It is like comparing a motorboat with a battleship.

What I have said is not in any way an apology—it is an assertion and a boast that the American people and their Government are doing an amazingly good job in carrying out a vast program which 2 years ago was said to be impossible of fulfillment. Luckily, the American people have a sense of proportion—and a memory.

As General Marshall has said in his biennial report:

The development of the powerful Army of today * * * has been dependent upon vast appropriations and the strong support of the Congress, and the cooperation of numerous Government agencies.

I urge all Americans to read General Marshall's fine soldierly record of the achievements of our Army throughout two of the most tremendous years in our history. This is a record which Americans will never forget.

As the war grows tougher and as new problems constantly arise in our domestic economy, changes in methods and changes in legislation may become necessary.

We should move for the greater economic protection of our returning men and women in the armed forces—and for greater educational opportunities for them—and for all our citizens we should provide a further measure of social security in order to protect them against certain continuing hazards of life.

All these things, as well as eventual demobilization, should be studied now and much of the necessary legislation should be enacted. I do not mean that this statement should be regarded in any way as an intimation that we are approaching the end of the war. Such an intimation could not be based either on fact or on reason. But when the war ends we do not want to be caught again without planning or legislation, such as occurred at the end of the last war.

On all these and on other subjects I expect to communicate with this Congress from time to time.

In this critical period in the history of our country and of the world, we seek cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government to furnish our citizens with the security of the standard of living to which their resources and their skills in management and labor entitle them in all matters which concern this Nation's

welfare, present and future—and the first of such matters, obviously, is the winning of this war.

Finally, as the war progresses, we seek a national cooperation with other nations toward the end that world aggression be ended and that fair international relationships be established on a permanent basis. The policy of the good neighbor has shown such success in the hemisphere of the Americas that its extension to the whole world seems to be the logical next step. In that way we can begin to keep faith with our sons and daughters who are fighting for freedom and justice and security at home and abroad.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 17, 1943.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] may address the House for 5 minutes this afternoon, following any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE FIRST LT. DAVID NATHANIEL MURDOCK

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the President's message stated that there were 7,445 American fighting men who gave their lives in the invasion of Sicily. One of those men was David Murdock, the eldest son of our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, Hon. JOHN MURDOCK. I know that in paying solemn tribute to him I express the feeling of every Member of the House. We pay our sincere homage and respect, and we offer a nation's reverent gratitude for this gallant sacrifice to the memory of a noble young American and to his bereaved parents, whom we know and love.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects. In one, to include a statement by Mr. Edward O'Neal, president of the Farm Bureau, and in the other a speech by Francis A. Flood, assistant to the War Food Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects; in one to include a speech delivered by Mr. Dewey L. Granberry, manager of the Chamber of Commerce, Victoria,

Tex., at a conference of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, held at Houston, Tex., on August 26, 1943; and in the other to extend a speech made at the same meeting by Mr. Frank E. Bourgeois, chairman of the Waterway Transportation and Development Committee of the Association of Commerce of New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Mr. John M. Fouts, of Fort Worth, Tex., general manager of the Trinity Improvement Association, at a conference of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, held at Houston, Tex., August 26, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday or Tuesday next, so it has been announced, the House will vote on the Fulbright resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) under a suspension of the rules, which precludes amendments. This concurrent resolution provides, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

There is not a reservation or limitation in the resolution to preserve, protect, or defend the sovereign rights of a sovereign people. International machinery can be set up, and undoubtedly will be set up, to which this resolution can commit this Government, and by which our people will be expected to and be called upon to finance, feed, and rehabilitate groups of people in each of the sixty-odd states which at present compose the family of nations.

This Fulbright resolution is purely a wild and reckless plunge in the dark without regard to the extent that the proposed international machinery may require the United States to destroy its own security, prosperity, standard of living, its liberties, and institutions which now exist by virtue of our constitutional guarantees.

We do not know whether the proposed international machinery to be set up is for Union Now or not. Prime Minister Churchill said:

No one can stop it. Like the Mississippi, it just keeps rolling along. Let it roll in full flood, inexorable, irresistible, to broader lands and better days.

Is Union Now to be our commitment under this resolution?

Hon. Leslie Hore-Belisha puts the proposal more boldly, thus:

Mr. Churchill had the imaginative idea of offering France a common citizenship. There is far more reason—

Said Leslie Hore-Belisha—

for common citizenship with America. If we can replace the Declaration of Independence—

Said he—

with a declaration of interdependence, it should lay the firmest foundation for permanent world peace.

It is not difficult to draw peace resolutions in a moment of emotionalism and pass them without debate, but what has been the history of treaties of peace, drawn with the intention that each should be permanent? The record shows that "from the year 1500 B. C. to A. D. 1860 more than 8,000 treaties of peace, meant to remain in force forever, were concluded. The average time they remained in force is 2 years."

It is an inherent right in every nation, based on self-preservation, that it shall retain the right to protect its sovereignty, its life, and its vital interests by every means at its disposal. I am sure that no reputable student of international law will dispute the soundness of this doctrine.

This proposed resolution, when examined by the people of more than 60 other members of the family of nations will be construed in the light of their respective hopes and desires. To all too many of them it will be a share the wealth of the United States program, by which each foreign nation will expect its portion under this resolution and other promises already made without the knowledge or consent of our people.

The best and surest way to assist the world is to stabilize the United States. The world cannot become stabilized until the United States becomes stabilized. A share the wealth of the United States program with the world is not a stabilizing plan but, instead, it is an international W. P. A. deficit-financing program, to be borne, not by foreign taxpayers, but by the taxpayers of the United States.

I am not willing to support a resolution which gives notice to the world that we have replaced our Declaration of Independence with a declaration of dependence.

On the monument over William Bradford's grave in Burial Hill, Plymouth, Mass., are carved these admonitory words:

Do not basely relinquish what the fathers with difficulty attained.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to me by the Worcester County War Price and Ration Boards Association together with

a resolution recommending a 14-point program of operation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on September 14 I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain declarations adopted by the Republican Post War Advisory Council. I find that this comprises more than two pages and have an estimate from the printer that the cost will be \$112.50. Notwithstanding this I desire to make the extension.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

(Mr. SAUTHOFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the president of the New Orleans Association of Commerce. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost \$120. I ask unanimous consent to extend this matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit as indicated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Judge J. F. T. O'Connor made in Los Angeles, Calif., on September 1.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

RESULT OF ELECTION IN SECOND DISTRICT KANSAS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, those who are following political trends will be interested in the election which took place in the Second District of Kansas this week. At that election the Republican candidate to succeed our late colleague, U. S. Guyer, received 69 percent of the total vote. Last November Mr. Guyer with the same opponent and with the same issues involved received 59 percent of the total vote.

I have no comment to make except to say I believe that this great increase in the Republican vote accurately reflects the trend of political sentiment in Kansas and surrounding States at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous consent requests. First, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Chase, president of the New England Council, recently, and, second, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I made at Williamstown, Vt., and, third, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENTAL FIGURES ON FOOD INACCURATE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the figures put out by the various Government authorities dealing with food are notoriously inaccurate. The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has been trying to reconcile the figures on the roll-back of prices recently given out by Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.

It is impossible to apply any accepted statistical principles to his announcement that an over-all reduction of 2.3 percent in the cost of living would result to the consuming public through rolling back the prices of the seven commodities he mentioned. If the entire estimated 1943 production of these seven commodities, that is, apples, oranges, onions, potatoes, lard, vegetable oils, and peanut butter were subsidized as he proposes, the aggregate cost of the subsidy would be approximately \$525,000,000, and not \$100,000,000 as Mr. Bowles stated.

Everyone knows that 1943 living costs are higher than 1942, yet in 1942 the over-all cost of living has been reported as \$69,000,000,000 in this country. Even if we spent \$525,000,000 to accomplish the roll-back which he talks about it would still be far from a 2.3 percent reduction in the cost of living. It would require \$1,600,000,000 to be paid in subsidies to do what he says can be done with \$100,000,000.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our colleague from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], I ask unanimous consent that he may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made by Mr. E. O. Taulbee, of Bay City, Tex.; also that I may have permission to put in the RECORD my own remarks and to include a statement on the betrayal of Palestine; second, to include a statement appearing in the Free World, which the Public Printer estimates will cost \$45; and third, to include a statement appearing in the New York Times, which I am advised will cost \$67.50; and fourth, to include a brief

poem by the Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain facts developed at the conferring of a Navy E in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I obtained permission to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by Ambassador Joseph Clark Grew at Bristol, Va., on September 6. At that time I did not realize that the speech would take more than two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer that the speech will occupy approximately three pages and the cost will be \$135. I ask unanimous consent that this speech may be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by the bankers of Indianapolis, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 30 minutes at the conclusion of all other business and after any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the reconvening of Congress I received permission from the House to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein an address delivered by our Civil Aeronautics Administrator. I have received word from the Public Printer that the speech runs in excess of the two pages allowed and that the cost will be \$112.50. I would not repeat my request ordinarily, but I believe the excellence of the things contained in the speech should be available to all Members, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this speech printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brochure sent to me by a constituent,

and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

THE PROBLEM OF RAISING AND DISTRIBUTING MORE FOOD

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I differ with what the President had to say in his message this morning, and correct one word. He states:

There were the problems of raising and distributing more food than ever before in our history.

I would correct the word "were" to make the sentence read, "There is the problem of raising and distributing more food than ever before in our history."

I have come directly from my district. I want to know why the agencies of government have not made it possible to release to the dairymen and the poultrymen of my section of up-State New York enough corn to feed their dairy herds and poultry flocks.

I intend to ask the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, for an investigation to find out why the O. P. A. has refused to raise the ceiling price on corn above \$1.07 a bushel for the midwestern farmers so that they can release this corn to eastern dairymen and poultrymen in my district in order that they may participate in the food for victory program, which the President expects them to do.

Unless my farmers can obtain feed corn, the country will face a real shortage of milk and eggs by October. This House must intervene and save our Nation from such a disaster.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the New York Journal-American, and also the report of the committee on domestic problems of the Republican Post-War Advisory Council at Mackinac Island, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

IMPORTATION FROM CANADA FREE OF DUTY OF CERTAIN GRAINS AND OTHER PRODUCTS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to follow the President's suggestion and see the doughnut instead of the hole. I call the attention of the majority leadership and also the minority leadership to the fact that I am today introducing a House joint resolution to permit the importation from Canada free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock feed. It reads as follows:

That notwithstanding the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, the following, when imported into the United States from Canada during the period of 90 days beginning with the date of enactment of this joint resolution, to be used as, or as a constituent part of, feed for livestock, shall be exempt from duty: Wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, or hay, or products of any of the foregoing. As used in this joint resolution the term "United States" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

The War Food Administration is very apprehensive of the future milk supply of our country. Marvin Jones yesterday at a meeting said that the price of milk to the consumer must advance to encourage or maintain milk production at the present level or else feeds must be made available in greater amounts.

We are in war. We cannot allow tariff walls to impede the war food program. Governmental agencies have urged more and more livestock production. Our obligation is to furnish this livestock feed from all available sources.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter written by a member of the armed forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the Hartford Courant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a speech I recently made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PITTINGER and Mr. COCHRAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in two instances and in one to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and

include therein an article written by Mr. Clergue C. Schilling, of Sault Ste. Marie.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INDUCTION OF FATHERS INTO THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation today is agitated over the question of the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. A situation obtains of which I think every one of us should take note. The military say they need these men, and they care not from where they come. Down in my section of the country I have talked to a number of members of draft boards and I have talked to a number of the people throughout that section. They tell me that in the Government services down there there are any number of single men or young married men who do not have children who are being deferred by their draft boards on the request of their employers. They tell me also that there are any number of single Negroes down there who are not at this time available for military service because the draft boards will not take them. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that section 4, paragraph A, of the Selective Service Act states that there shall be no discrimination as to race or color, and that every man shall be given the same opportunity to serve his country.

Yet, when the Selective Service sends quota directives down to the local draft boards they stipulate so many white men and so many Negroes. One board in my district told me that their September quota called for 82 white men and 31 Negroes. That same draft board said that to fill this quota they would have to take 9 pre-Pearl Harbor white fathers, yet they had a pool of 281 single and childless Negroes, all processed and ready to go. Is that no discrimination against those white fathers? Certainly it is. If the law means what it says, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the Selective Service has no right to say send me so many men of this color and so many of that. Their only right is to request so many men in each quota. Did not the military authorities say that they did not care where the men came from but that they needed so many? Then why do not they act like they talk? I demand, Mr. Speaker, that the Selective Service follow the letter of the law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial appearing in the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a statement and resolution on the Edwards Perpetual Calendar, regarding which I presented a resolution to the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on the subject of war veterans' legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

NEW TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have just read reports through press that members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House criticize the administration leaders for a long delay in submitting a tax program for this year. Very likely this is a just criticism, but if this Congress is to wait for the administration to make up its mind we will be again confronted with some more last-minute legislation.

I see no reason why this House should not do a little legislating on its own and not wait for plans and blueprints to be handed us by the executive department of the Government on the tax question. Furthermore, we do not want any retroactive tax legislation for this year. I realize we are spending more than twice of the amount raised in taxes, but even at that I think the ordinary average taxpayer has just about as much of a tax load as he can carry right now. The individual in the lower and middle brackets is already taxed to the limit on his income.

The committee could do a lot of good among other things if it would submit legislation that would simplify these tax reports that are giving people a lot of headaches throughout the country right now. Personally, I just don't see the necessity for all these complicated reports. Mr. Speaker, I trust that, whatever legislation is submitted in the way of providing for additional revenue, it will not wait until the last minute as has been the case so many times in the past.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the Record by including an address by the Commissioner of Agriculture, Tom Linder, of Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include the recommendations of the Michigan Food Conference of Farmers, Processors, and Distributors, held August 9, 1943, at Lansing, Mich.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the New York Sun entitled "Italian Finance."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RUMML PLAN

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, now that that awesome date of horrifying memories is behind us, that 15th day of September when 50,000,000 Americans were put on the tax rack, everyone, I am quite sure, will agree that the so-called modified Ruml tax plan is the very worst tax measure ever to be written upon the statute books. To the American people, the very thought of it is a nightmare.

If old Beelzebub himself were intent on producing a tax measure to drive a rugged people to the point of distraction, he could not have done a better job than in producing this "very simple" Ruml plan with its tantalizing system of estimates and reestimates, calculations and recalculations, adjustments and readjustments, all these with penalties and penalties, piled on penalties.

It is not surprising that the then proponents of this thoroughly unworkable revenue monstrosity, realizing, as all of them now do, the failure of their program, should be screaming to the heavens for simplification. When a law has been demonstrated as fundamentally unsound, why half-measures? Is not outright repeal the answer?

"Pay as you go before you know what you owe" simply cannot be made to work. The sooner we make up our minds to abandon this fallacious formula and return to the time-honored principle of "pay as you go when you know what you owe" the better it will be for our country. So let us wipe Ruml and all of his works from our statute books as soon as the good Lord will let us.

There is an old saying that "50,000 Frenchmen can't be wrong," but, true or false, Banker Ruml, single-handedly and alone, has certainly thrown 50,000,000 American taxpayers for a loop.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative program today and all other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the legislative business of today and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of my remarks the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a resolution recently adopted by the Executive Committee, Department of Massachusetts, American Legion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a newspaper story of Senator CAPPER's farm conference at Topeka.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DIRECTIVE GOVERNMENT

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion go by without saying that while this is a certain birthday, it is also Constitution Day. Yet, contrary to all of the years before, we have not heard one word about it. Is this the result of the growing directive

government that we have, so that we have no chief executive anywhere, or even a newspaper, that has once referred to this 17th day of September as Constitution Day, a day we used to have programs in every village of the country? I listened to the splendid address of the President on the war effort, and it was a good message, but there are two other fronts in Washington going on all the time besides the war effort. One is the effort trying to change the form of government, and the other is the activity in favor of the fourth term. I am wondering if the setting aside of Constitution Day, in celebration, is not in line with the development of this directive government that is building up today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McKENZIE] about the drafting of Government employees, I determined to join him and suggest that before we draft any pre-Pearl Harbor fathers with children, that we draft several hundred thousand Federal Government employees that are now hiding away in Government dugouts and fox holes all over this country and particularly in the city of Washington, and put them in the armed forces of the United States.

Before calling upon the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers back in our own districts, and families that have already given two or three sons, why not draft Government employees, power-hungry bureaucrats, and O. P. A. gestapo agents, if they will not volunteer themselves. I have in mind one under secretary, 32 years of age, being paid \$10,000 a year, with a wife receiving \$7,000 from the Government pay roll, and they have no children. Such men should be the first to set an example and not receive or accept a deferment. I think before we draft the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, with children, we should dig out several hundred thousand Federal employees in Government dugouts and put them in our armed forces. None of them is indispensable. Women and veterans of the World War could replace everyone of them. Already 90,000 deferments have been granted and that is 90,000 too many.

Let us in Congress put an end to these Government deferments and special privileges and favoritism and treat all American citizens on the same basis whether holding safe Federal appointments on the Government pay roll or in private life.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and embody a letter that I have received from one of the fighting soldiers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POLITICAL SNIPING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have followed closely today the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and other Republicans, as I also did last Tuesday the statements of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], and read with amazement the extension of remarks of many other Republicans in Tuesday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is extremely difficult for me to understand how they justify their unwarranted attacks, criticisms, and snipings against the administration.

A few days ago the outstanding Republicans—well, I will not say outstanding Republicans, but some Republicans—including the gentlemen whom I have mentioned, and many other Republican Members of Congress, attending the Mackinac Island conference, spoke for the Republican Party and endorsed the administration's foreign policy and agreed to its domestic policy. In view of that action, it would appear to me that those Members who took the floor today and Tuesday, instead of encouraging should discourage unfair criticism of the departments. After reading the reports of the Mackinac Island conference, I felt that there would be closer cooperation, unity, and accord, and a joining in harmonious action in order to encourage our fighting forces to still greater efforts to insure an early, speedy, and decisive victory.

Of course, some of the outstanding Republicans maintained that it was not a real Republican gathering because ex-President Hoover and two former Republican Presidential candidates—Mr. Landon and Mr. Willkie—were not only not present, but were not even invited. Nevertheless, I am inclined to think that there has been a Republican savor to the conference. A friend of mine stated that the conference was held at Mackinac Island, Mich.—where people go to be cured of hay fever—and it was hoped that others might be cured of other fevers. Another friend of mine stated that it is a good fishing resort and that the conference was held to agree on the best possible fishing bait for 1944—a bait with which the Republicans might be able to catch the largest number of suckers. Personally, of course, I am not in position to state the underlying reason why they selected Mackinac Island, nor will I charge that it was a Republican conference. Nevertheless, only Republicans were invited, including Members of the Senate and House, such as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], and even another gentleman from

New York [Mr. FISH]; yes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]; and even some Republican Governors—I am told that there were 20 of them in attendance. After 2 days of planning and conferring to everyone's surprise they endorsed President Roosevelt's foreign policy. Therefore, I believe it is manifestly unfair when, only a few days thereafter, these gentlemen should again pursue their fault-finding policy, and to go far afield in attacking the Fulbright resolution with respect to participation by the United States in prevention of future aggression and the maintenance of peace.

Their action must appear to the people to be contradictory to the matured deliberations in the Grand Mackinac Island Hotel. I fully appreciate that there will be some Republicans who will not quite agree with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to say that it is rather strange to me that all Members who opposed and voted against our preparedness or defense programs, instead of admitting the errors of their ways, should continue to find fault with our war efforts. Rather than work for complete unity and harmony they seek to bring about discord. I am making these few observations in the hope that we will work in harmony, cooperate, and show to the members of our armed forces we are ready and willing to give every aid in every way possible. We have our brutal enemies on the run. Let us work and pull together until they are completely defeated and destroyed in order that we may prove to our future generations how all of us did our part and share in gaining a great victory for humanity and the preservation of our democratic form of government and its Constitution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POLITICAL SNIPING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my colleague from Chicago, the soldier and farmer from Chicago, that in talking about this sniping—

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the rules, when a Member addresses the House and calls attention to another Member, it is required that he state "the gentleman from" the State from which he hails, and which he in part represents. The gentleman from Michigan does me the honor invariably to state "the gentleman from Chicago." I am proud of the fact that I am a citizen of

Chicago, but under the rules I think it is required that he should omit the city which I have the honor to represent, and should give credit to the State of which we are Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it the ruling of the Chair that I shall not refer to him as "the gentleman from Chicago"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The rules require that a Member in referring to another Member use the name of the State from which he comes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are several gentlemen from Illinois. I would not want anyone to misunderstand—not to know to whom I am referring. So if the gentleman will tell me from what district he comes, I will refer to him as "the gentleman from such and such a district of Illinois." I did—I do—not wish to refer to the Member by name.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan may proceed in order.

Mr. SABATH. I will enlighten the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like order, Mr. Speaker. I do not now wish to be interrupted.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman desires information.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I decline to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan declines to yield. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, humbly do I apologize, not only to the House, but to the gentleman from the — district of the State of Illinois for having referred to his place of residence, of which he seems to be somewhat ashamed. I only want to call attention to the fact that the so-called sniping to which he referred was applauded by the soldiers in the gallery before they were called to order by the Speaker of the House, and if the farmer and soldier from the State of Illinois, from that unknown district, would forget his political sniping we would get along with the war effort.

The men in the armed service do not look with approval at—their sense of the fitness of things is outraged by—the fact that this administration is sheltering thousands—yes, perhaps hundreds of thousands—of young men in Government jobs who might well be called to the service of their country, were it not for the attitude of the President, who by order deferred Abe Fortas, thirty-odd years of age, with a \$10,000 annual salary and a wife on the Federal pay roll drawing \$5,600, but with neither chick nor child.

The draft authorities seem to be interested not at all in calling to the colors young men—not fathers—who are, however, politically helpful to the administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE DRAFTING OF PRE-PEARL HARBOR FATHERS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, relative to this drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, I quite agree with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] it is about time that the Congress gave some consideration to these parasitic bureaucrats who are firmly entrenched in cushy-seated swivel-chair jobs at salaries ranging from \$3,500 to \$10,000 a year.

The average American boy in our communities throughout the various districts of the country are inducted into service at \$50 a month, to have their insides splashed out on the sands of north Africa or Sicily, or die like rats in submarines, or blasted to their eternity in the air; they do their jobs in a fine, patriotic, American manner. The various boards throughout the country are doing a splendid job in handling selective service, regardless of whether a man is high or low, rich or poor, whether they are Catholic, Jew, or Protestant, whether they are Republican or Democrat, they get a square deal. They are taking their places in fine American manner; they ask for no deferments; they know there is a job to do, and they are doing it. Down here in Washington, however, there are thousands of these bureaucratic termites who are given deferment and security when they should step up like honest Americans, thankful for being American, and take their places and serve in the United States armed forces.

I think the Congress should give this matter immediate consideration at this time, and if necessary compel these deferred bureaucrats to take their places in the Army and Navy as other American boys.

The public is shocked that this condition would be permitted to exist in the District of Columbia. Those boys who are considered bright young men are granted deferment.

Brigadier General Hershey should submit to the Congress a report of the situation existing in the District of Columbia, and the local boards here in Washington should have the authority to see that justice is done.

The time may come when we may find it necessary to draft pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, but until every available eligible single man is in the service no action should be taken on pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

The cry here in Washington is that these bureaucrats are necessary to the war effort. I am satisfied that we can get along with the war effort in a more satisfactory manner if they were put in the service, where they rightfully belong, like other American boys. A great many here in Washington who have been granted deferment are responsible for the social reforms that are causing confusion, conflict, and chaos in this fight on the home front, and the quicker we

rid the Government of this element the greater will be our productivity.

If military exigencies demand the fathers, well and good; but first purge the list of selective service here in the District of Columbia on what is termed "necessary men to the war effort." This purge is needed, and needed badly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the first day following the disposition of the Fulbright resolution and following the disposition of all business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISH. I would like to ascertain from the Speaker if there is any way to obtain permission, by unanimous consent, to address the House for 1 minute, having already done so?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are special orders pending.

Mr. FISH. I know, Mr. Speaker, and my inquiry is whether having spoken once I might make a unanimous consent request to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The practice of the House is to recognize the same Member not more than 1 minute.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I make the request by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York desires to break the long practice of the House?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to respect the rules of the House and make the request by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the request of the gentleman from New York. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the gentleman from New York that what he is asking would break a custom that we have had for years, a custom that has gone along very satisfactorily. As a matter of fact, I think it should be the concern of the gentleman on that side as much or more than mine to see that the practice is respected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts can arrange for the House to hear me long enough to clear up one point. I only want to answer the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Rules Committee, criticizing the Mackinac conference report

on American foreign policies. If the gentleman is going to insert that kind of statements in the RECORD he should be answered and that is all I wanted permission to address the House for 1 minute; I really do not need to take as much time as a minute, a half a minute would do to answer such a silly criticism. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will allow it I can make the explanation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I am not arguing, I am trying to preserve something that has proven a benefit to all of us and the gentleman from New York himself ought to want to preserve it in the interest of order.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I may not insist on the request. I just want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if the chairman of the Rules Committee would grant a rule permitting the House to substitute the Mackinac conference report on Foreign policies for the Fulbright resolution, I would go along as it is a much stronger and constructive proposal and far more comprehensive and understandable.

Mr. McCORMACK. This colloquy, Mr. Speaker, has permitted the gentleman from New York to accomplish what he sought and preserve a practice.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD at this point:

WE MUST TRY TO SUCCEED

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the plan to bring the Fulbright resolution on for a vote Monday, for myself I want to express a belief that is a good thing to do. Our war effort, at home and abroad, needs an expression from the Congress on the subject of post-war goals. The inadequacy of unconditional surrender as a formula when an enemy nation collapses is shown in Italy. Had there been ready, when Mussolini stepped down, a positive program, the forces of the United Nations might have stepped in and established their positions instead of giving that time and opportunity to Hitler. It would have saved lives lost at Salerno.

And again, speaking for myself, as I said on this floor on July 5, prior to the recess, the time has come in the history of the world when the responsible nations must join together to maintain law and order. When victory on the battle fronts comes, as it is coming, we must not lose the opportunity and the responsibility to maintain order and to establish the foundations of law.

We should not and need not take steps that are involved and complicated. We need not surrender our sovereignty and we need not ask other nations to surrender their sovereignty. Neither we nor they need to give to any group the right to pass resolutions or treaties binding upon us or them until each has passed upon them in its own way of ratification. We need, however, to provide the machinery for establishing order and for providing law.

We may not succeed in preventing all wars. This generation, however, which has seen two world wars, has the obligation to try to establish a condition which

will mean more of peace and less of war. History will not condemn us utterly if we fail; but humanity can never forgive us if we fail to try.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar on Monday be dispensed with and that it be in order to call the calendar on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I notice the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee is present. He spoke to me just a moment ago stating that he had some noncontroversial bills that had passed the Senate, which were coming up on Monday. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider those bills on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the District Committee, who is present, advise the House what the bills are, so that the Members will have advance notice?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I will place a statement to that effect in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that it will appear in the RECORD during this colloquy?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I shall be pleased to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that the Members will be apprised of the bills.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The measures, all having passed the Senate unanimously, are:

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938;

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States were saddened when the late Dr. Lin Sen, President of China, a profound scholar and gentleman, a fine philosopher, with high ideals, dignified conduct, and courage, died. The late President of China aroused our admiration and respect.

The action of the plenary meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang in electing Generalissimo

Chiang Kai-shek as his successor is to be congratulated.

Under the leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek the brave people of China have been fighting a vicious, destructive foe for over 6 years.

The name of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek is identified with the spirit of China of today. He truly represents the spirit of China of today in its pain, and of the greatness of China in the courage and determination of its people to preserve their independence. He will represent the strength of Chinese character and stability under post-war conditions.

His leadership of his people has been superb in war. It will be outstanding in peace.

Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, as a military leader, as a statesman leading and guiding his people under most trying circumstances, will go down in history as one of the outstanding men of the world's history.

He will truly and properly take his place in the history of China as one of its greatest sons.

To the people of China I know I express the sentiment of my colleagues in the House, without regard to party, in extending our congratulations on the selection of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, military leader, philosopher, statesman, as their President. No better choice could have been made.

To Gen. Chiang Kai-shek we extend the best wishes of a friendly people, a friendly nation, and a friendly ally, and our assurances of cooperation in every way possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PRICE OF MILK

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been convinced that something should be done to give the producers of milk in the United States an increased price for their products. I am more convinced of that as a result of conferences and conversations I have had with milk producers in the State of Connecticut during the past 2 months' recess. I doubt if any agency of this Government will now contend that the milk farmer is receiving the cost of production plus a fair return for his labor and his investment. Several people with whom I talked during the recess were inclined to blame Congress because something had not been done to aid the milk farmer. It is my contention that the blame should not be placed on Congress, that Congress dealt with that situation adequately when it passed the Price Control Act and its amendments of October 1942. The act very clearly provides that when due to increased cost of labor or other reasons the producer of a farm product is not receiving a fair return for his product adjustments, not "may be made" but "shall be made." It may take some additional time to work out a solution of the problem nationally, but with the powers given to the Administrator of O. P. A. in the Price Control Act itself and funds that this Congress has made available for that purpose, there is no reason why relief should not

be given the milk producer, particularly in the very acute spots that are known to exist.

Some people feel it would be dangerous to permit an increase in the retail price of milk. I fail to see how anyone can object to the milk producers of this Nation at least receiving the benefits of the so-called Little Steel formula. If the milk farmers of my district were permitted an increase in their wages which would come to them through an increase in the price of their milk of 15 percent, you would not hear much complaining from the milk farmers of that area as to price; in other words, give the farmer the benefit of the Little Steel formula, at least bring them up to that level. With that thought in mind I am dropping into the hopper today a resolution that simply directs the Administrator of the Price Control Act to comply with and make effective the provisions of Federal Law No. 729 of the Seventy-seventh Congress—the Price Control Act—calling particular attention to the second proviso of section 3, which I now quote:

Provided further, That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

Whether or not Congress can compete with the directives of the Executive branch of the Government remains to be seen, but I do believe that we must issue certain directives to some people in the bureaus of our Government directing them to carry out the clearly, plainly stated intentions and orders of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, during the Congressional recess just concluded, I made it my very earnest business to conduct comprehensive inquiries among my people of Louisiana, in an effort to determine their views concerning the problems which they consider affect them most at this time. To be frank with my colleagues here in the House, I find everywhere interest and concern to be concentrated, for the most part, in the problems that definitely relate to home matters. In other words, our people here in America, essentially are interested in things American. They still dedicate themselves to those tasks they deem necessary to the protection and perpetuation of the fundamentals of American life. They are proud in the fact that they are, first of all, Americans. They want, first of all, to provide for their own common defense against all outside influences that have

as their primary consideration, the welfare of peoples, strange both to our political ideals and to our economic standards of life. Our citizens, ladies and gentlemen, still insist upon their right to the freedom of promoting, first of all, their own general welfare. They see and they recognize some of the squabbles of the Far East, the Middle East, the Near East, as well as in all other directions of the compass, but I am convinced that leadership in this country will prove to be short sighted if it concludes that Americans forever will allow themselves to be distracted from those selfish principles, so justifiably advocated by a self-respecting and independent people in the very charters of their own existence. Our people, ladies and gentlemen, today, still are interested in establishing justice, in their own land, if you please, and intend, whether someone else likes it or not, to provide for the establishment of tranquillity, at least among themselves. Given by God Almighty a bounteous economy that should form the basis of continued prosperity and happiness for our own great land, our people zealously intend to protect such treasure by defending it, first and foremost, by exploiting our God-given blessings in the name of our own general welfare, by insisting upon justice for all in our great country, and by so regulating our own political, social, and economic affairs as to make for peace and tranquillity at home in America.

In recognizing the essential character of American thought today, we representatives of the American public are, in my opinion, duty bound to give careful analysis and profound consideration to the grave issues confronting our country, to the end that our acts here can be made to conform to the wishes of the people, and not to the dictates of any political dictator or the exaggerated ego of any inflated bureaucrat. It is our solemn duty, furthermore, to examine these vital issues with the thought in mind that we are charged with responsibilities not only of protecting the principles to which our people always have subscribed, but also, to provide a leadership for America so that, along the lines of her traditionally adhered-to policies, this free country can go forward without the imposition upon her of any alien force, either of intrigue, cajolery, economic threats, or the power of arms.

We are now engaged in a great war of world-wide proportions—one which every good American willingly supports and one which we must win. Underlying our determined purpose in this high resolve, I have found that there runs a fear on the part of many of our citizens that whilst fighting abroad for the great principles we hold so dear, we may lose them at home; that whilst prating the virtues of a democracy we once so firmly established, we may be losing it, in fact, by subjecting our country to the imposition of financial and economic burdens too terrible even for our system to endure; and, what is more, whilst following our flag through the far-away jungles and over the highways and seas of the world, we may be lowering our guard, so to speak, to allow an infiltration into our

national life of foreign ideologies, alien "isms," fascist or communistic tendencies that surely may contaminate our own democratic atmosphere, regiment our people—both in body and in mind—and bring to us dangerous warning of the possible transition of our American system into something new and strange to us—fashioned by the minds of foreigners and advocated, within our midst, by people newly come to our shores.

Some persons today omit consideration of present problems and jump to the post-war world.

Our esteemed Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, now calls upon us to join some other nations of the world after the war shall have ended, so that we can crack down on criminals who would, in future time, start wars in other sections of the globe—to keep the peace, as we want it, everywhere. Without going into the question of principle as to just what the right and the wrong of future issues may be as they arise—depending, of course, upon the perspective from which they may be viewed—I believe the people of America, in future years and before sacrificing more and more of their blood and their treasure, finally will insist upon knowing that the causes for which they are to do battle be causes characterized as real American issues. Most of our people believe that the world will ever see wars, more wars, and rumors of wars. Most of our people want to avoid a national policy that will keep America perpetually in wars revolving essentially around foreign issues. Most of our peoples do not care a rap about how hotheaded a Heinie becomes over his pet "isms," so long as it does not infringe upon our own political doctrine or our own well-being. Most of our people do not care at all whether the Italian nation goes fascistic or to a spaghetti dinner, so long as such doings do not deny us the freedom for which we have fought. Most of our people, also, are not inclined to die fighting or to give our last crust of bread in order to preserve present-day world-wide empires—whether monarchic or communistic; whether present friend or present foe—unless such sacrifice be absolutely justified in the name of vital American issues.

This business of setting upon the international gangsters is one thing, but, fellow members, I have found that we have imported into this great country of ours, some foreigners who have become scoundrels in our own land. Their sons, in many instances, have followed in their father's footsteps—to produce for us, second generations of American citizens, some of whom seem still more interested in European boundary questions, foreign racial problems, alien isms, and world power politics, than they are in some of our American home problems. In fact these people, some of whom sit either in high seats of political machines to control voting in this country or even in seats of high governmental authority, constitute very definite dangers to numerous of our home communities.

I say that the international gangsters are rightly condemned by Mr. Hull, but, what about the gangsters in our own

home? What about them—of alien persuasion and influence—many sitting high in political power in our local communities—too many of whom, alas, already have infiltrated directly into the fabric of our own national governmental structure. These people seem surcharged, first with international leaning, bent upon diluting or destroying the American economy, and on effecting change in our political system in favor of foreign issues and peoples not only strange to us and to the ideals for which we have lived but also, in fact, jealous of our successful experiment in democracy; eager, I believe, to sap our strength in the so-called post-war world to the end that they may have easy life through living off the substance of the sweat, the toil, and industrious enterprise of our people.

While talking about the international squabbles of the world and while discussing the needed chastisement of all the international gangsters Mr. Hull's future world may produce, let us Americans, as we spill the blood of our boys and distribute the treasure of our land to all the good neighbors who want it for their own, let us never be distracted to a point where we forget that the bestism for us is that found only in Americanism—Americanism that was born in such great pronouncements as the Declaration of Independence, Washington's Farewell Address and the Monroe Doctrine. In these State documents are to be found the real Americanism that will save us today. The principles and policies set forth in these great declarations are those which should guide us today in solving the problems of America, now being ignored in favor of world issues.

With victory after victory recorded to our credit, and looking forward to end this war of blood and hate, we should now record our views and aims in the new war of economics to come. The new era will create new isms and some of these isms may be aimed at the very economic structure and foundation of this Nation.

When our boys return home they will take stock of our stewardship during their absence. Our actions and votes will all be subject to their scrutiny. Idealism, the lack of foresight and vigilance on our part will not be an answer to their just and promised demands "We want our jobs back—a chance to make a living." Already we have underwritten the world ills and furnished the men, money and materials. All this and more has been poured into this war of blood, and the end is not yet in sight.

The world leaders, guided by military and political strategy, may be the masters and in charge of the peace strategy and aims in the war of economics. Can we continue to subscribe blindly to some of these aims now in the making? Will the same power be surrendered by us in the war of economy as in the war of blood? Will the old cry be raised, "This is an emergency and it is unpatriotic to question our leaders?" We know the power of international salesmanship, capitalizing the maudlin sentimentality of some of our people in the

impractical dream of one world—meaning the abolishing of all economic barriers. Since time immemorial it has been blood, faith, tradition, and greed and will be ever so. It has been the textbook of every power. It is the textbook of today and tomorrow. We have boastfully and rightfully stated to the world we are the richest nation on earth. We have hung our sign up and we have opened the doors. In this economic war to come, will we defend our economic shores—as well as we defend them in this war of blood? Nations never stand still—they go up, or they go under—that was proven in the last war and will be proven in this war. We have a sacred duty before us: This Nation was entrusted to us to defend and pass on to the future generations intact. The clear straight road for our country is clearly defined in two great documents—the Declaration of Independence, and the Monroe Doctrine. There should be a rereading of both. And, if we follow that course America will remain great. An interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, clearly and ably analyzed in a recent book, *My Country 'Tis of Thee*, should open the eyes of every American to the economic dangers facing us.

I quote as follows:

One of the greatest principles ever enunciated by American statesmanship is that which is known, the world over, as the Monroe Doctrine. Supported wholeheartedly by the American people since the day on which its announcement placed their Nation on record as forbidding any further acquisitions by European nations of territory in the Western Hemisphere, the Monroe Doctrine—so called from its author President James Monroe—was definitely a defensive measure. It threw security around the nations of both North and South America by placing the force and power of the United States as a guaranty against imperialistic design on the part of any ambitious foreign government. For, as President Monroe proclaimed, the United States, in future, would regard any attempt by any European power to extend its system to additional territory in the Western Hemisphere as an "unfriendly act," directed against the peace and security of America.

The doctrine was enunciated at a time when empires were in the process of building, through their espousal of imperialistic policy. It came forth as nations aspired to greatness through the ruthless domination of foreign peoples and through the so-called right that lay in the conquest, by force of arms, of other peoples' territory and the great riches of the world. Historically, it was the first great call from a decent section of humanity, in idealistic protest against the crass policy of imperialism other nations shamelessly had adopted as a natural means toward their own aggrandizement.

The purpose and spirit of the doctrine were idealistic, genuine, and sincere. The doctrine, moreover, was practical in the extreme. As America realized and abhorred the moral injustice of the expansion of imperialism throughout the world, so she knew that such an encroachment in the theater of her own hemisphere must, of necessity, eventually threaten her own national sovereignty and the welfare of her own free people. Her challenge to the further introduction and spread of imperialism, therefore, held both high ideals and good, practical sense as well.

With such support, the world has learned that America means business when it comes to a matter of defending the Monroe Doctrine.

Its assertion originally was an act of real statesmanship, and the policy to which the United States has dedicated itself in effectuating its purpose has been a wise and successful one.

But prior to the time of the adoption of the Monroe Doctrine the world, so to speak, was considered to be a "free for all" for adventure, an open sesame for the certain and willing admittance to the greatest of its treasures, for all those of courage and of piratical disposition who girded themselves with the arms and armadas necessary to assert dominance over and to subjugate the weak. From the booty gained from such state of affairs had come the growth of empire and the installation of supreme dignity in the government of modern man. From such also had evolved the "greatness" and the so-called majesty of rich emperors and monarchs whose edicts and pronouncements then directed the destinies of the vast majorities of the world's people. From such also had grown the rule of aristocracy, the so-called best of humanity—that upper section of human society that gained, in most parasitical manner, its livelihood and support from the menials over whom it ruled.

Taxation of its subjects by such government, with the accompanying premise that their representation in the government which their taxes supported was "taboo," became such an accepted principle that all dignity and majesty were upset at the mere thought that mere man should even think of expressing a desire, much less a determination, for an actual participation in the government which his labors maintained and which his blood defended on the field of the battles that his overlord planned.

It was but natural that democracy, born of common effort in America and supported by an individualism that naturally had not allowed itself to be subjugated to such rule, would rebel at the expansion of imperialistic policy in the Americas. The Monroe Doctrine was but the emphasizing of the irreconcilable differences between the genuine individualist and the real imperialist. It accentuated, also, the differences in the ideals to which each subscribed in the furtherance of policy in their respective governments. It strongly implied that clash of arms would be inevitable were the two ideals to come into conflict. And it warned the world to avoid such conflict in the Western Hemisphere.

The Monroe Doctrine put an end to the idea that, by swashbuckling display and brute force, world-wide empires could subjugate the individualism of the Americas. In effect, the doctrine announced that the robbery of peoples and the piratical expeditions of European governments, so far as we of our particular hemisphere are concerned, would cease. We rather preferred to go about in our own freely chosen way, to build the best we could build in the way of government of our people and to develop, as freemen, the bounteous economy with which our particular section of the world naturally had been blessed.

And, free from European intrigue and influence, we have developed our Government, as we, also, have maintained freedom in our democracy. We have, too, developed and exploited, to a full extent, our wondrously bounteous economy in America. Hand in hand with the progress in our development, both in government and in our economies, we have enjoyed a freedom for individuals in this country to the likes of which no person of any other part of the world can lay claim. This we have done because of the protection afforded us by the Monroe Doctrine. It has kept us free from the depredations foreign imperialists have imposed upon weaker peoples elsewhere. It has isolated and protected us from the baneful effects of imperialistic policy.

But just as we today can appreciate fully the beneficial results that have flowed from our Monroe Doctrine, so, also, must we conclude that wisdom in national policy dictates the restriction of government to the bounds of the peculiar economy that supports it. This is true, of course, in principle. The Monroe Doctrine has, in its way, demonstrated the efficacy of such principle.

This principle, however, applies not alone to the manner in which it has been insisted upon by our Nation—it works in two directions. Logical reasoning suggests that the adoption of the principle of the Monroe Doctrine would be a natural and proper policy, e. g., for the nations of Europe. For the economy of Europe well could be protected, too, by the adoption of such principle. And such is to say, that imperialistic policy should be opposed by such principle anywhere or at any time, otherwise the economy of nations can be intruded upon in unnatural fashion by foreign imperialistic policy, to the detriment of the nations that suffer such imposition.

For the American people, then, to sense excuse for their seizure, in the Eastern Hemisphere, of islands adjacent to the European Continent, would be to flaunt arrogant, if not, indeed, flippant, disregard of those basic principles and rights of peoples to their own protection, which we insist upon for ourselves, but, in so doing, would deny to others. Every section of the world that embraces a homogeneous economy should have its own Monroe Doctrine to protect its own rights and privileges; and no other section of the world, on peril of a war of defense, should violate such a doctrine. For misguided leadership of America to advocate the possible capture by us of the Cape Verde Islands, e. g., or of a portion of Africa, the better, so to have it, in the way of protecting freedom and democracy in our Western Hemisphere, is to leap upon a swiftly moving policy bent toward hemispherical wars—a policy of aggression—a policy of destruction for the American system of government and all that it means in the way of freedom and liberty for the individual. Such would be worthy only of the vagaries of a mad mind, an inconsistency unworthy of the name of statesmanship—a measure that only madness could conceive as one of defense for us.

But just as the Monroe Doctrine sprang from the determination of American individualism to protect its own political system of democracy against the depredations of European imperialism, so has there developed increased tension in the European economy which houses the headquarters of the kings and queens of imperialism. This tension in European economies has come about, in part, due to the fact that, of late, there are few more worlds left for imperialism to conquer. This has resulted in an increasing scarcity of the booty, in the way of economic advantages, in a shortage of the wealth of natural resources belonging to other peoples. In such circumstances, European imperialistic powers have been compelled to turn to a more serious struggle for their existence, one grounded in the problems of economics, a far more difficult struggle, submerged, as it is, in the competition with other nationalities of equal rank and quality, than had been the earlier one which was characterized by the sallies of freebooters and throat slitters upon ignorant and unprepared natives of the seven seas.

The economies of the European nations became specialized to a high degree, and European imperialism, spread as it was, over all the world's face and embracing many and diverse economies, became an anomaly in government and in economics that simply and naturally could not and would not function effectively or properly. Its attempt to do so, without the abnormal upsets that go with war, disrupted its natural economic

tempo. Its own efforts became nullified by the many inconsistencies encountered in its diverse and complex problems.

All this development followed the acquisition of territories scattered throughout the world in all the different economies of the world, each with its own peculiar problems and opportunities, unsuited to being geared to that which the European economy of the homeland had to offer to such a system. America had recognized the lack of homogeneity of European economy with that of its own, and such recognition was one reason why she enunciated the Monroe Doctrine in the hope of avoiding being drawn into the vortex of a futile attempt toward the admixture of two unmixable substances.

The truth in this regard, that America, wisely, in her early history had realized, went unseen, however, by her neighbor, Canada—which always has enjoyed the same blessings of the identical economy as that on which the United States has built so magnificently. No more splendid example of an inconsistency in government exists, where civilized and cultured men live, than in Canada. Part and big parcel of the North American economy of which the United States is the heart, Canada, still is tied, politically, with the giant of dying European imperialism—pushed and pulled economically to a point where her living standard has never kept pace with us—dragged by the mother country into every European war, the basic issues of which were always unrelated to her proper path of destiny. And so—Canada bleeds under her unnatural combination of government and economics, and longs for the better things her people could naturally have, but for the damnable political ties that bind her to a foreign and archaic system that must surely die. Housed in an economy bounteous and as yet, unexploited, Canada groans under the weight of old Europe's pains—as yet not alive to the beneficial influences to be derived from nature's wealth when untied from the foolishness of a political system unsuited to its economy.

But, inexorable as are the natural laws in their functioning, so is it inevitable that Canada and the United States, embracing, as they do, the same natural economy, ultimately, from natural causes, will combine to support a common political system, indigenous to their common economy, and free from European political ties. It is incomprehensible that Canada, a part of the bounteous North American economy, should, in most unnatural manner, continue under a political system blighted by the European economy of scarcity. The political ties that pull her into Europe's every war of destruction eventually must weaken and part, as her economy will be called upon—more and more—to support a system foreign and unnatural to it, and to the political ideals of her people.

And this matter of America's economic bedmate's political alignment to a system foreign to that of our own—and to hers as well (since the economy of both Canada and the United States is homogeneous) will become a matter of ever-increasing moment, so far as our national policy is concerned. If America is to be spared the threats incident to the continual bringing of European struggles next door to her, she well may be compelled to go the Monroe Doctrine one step further.

On account of the fact that Canada, for no reason other than her motherland's battle over purely European issues, is compelled to inject her portion of North America's territory and economy into the uncertainties of European squabbles, America must reckon with a new danger that, today, equals, if not transcends, that which first impelled the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine. It is time now, therefore, to give thought to the need for complete abolition forever—and in the name of our national defense—of all ties

that bind any part of America with Europe and its policies which conflict, seemingly evermore, with our own.

Under the Monroe Doctrine, America forever forbade European countries to acquire additional territory in the Western Hemisphere. She did this in days when ribaldry and piracy were legitimized by government under the "by right of conquest" principle of empire building. Today, when the economies of the world are highly specialized as to different sections of it, when time has allowed the natural evolution of political development to harmonize with the various economies that naturally support it, America should assert herself—as her spokesman Monroe once before so ably did—and declare to the world that her policy henceforth will be to oppose, as an unfriendly act, the continued possession by any European power of any territory whatsoever in her particular sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere, viz., the North American Continent and its adjacent islands. By giving effect to such principle, Canada can be freed, as we freed ourselves, from the baneful influences of European political government in exerting its authority and power over freemen of the New World. So freed, Canada then can take her rightful place alongside the United States, to develop to the utmost, that part of the bounteous North American economy which is hers. Being essentially of similar racial, ethnological, and lingual origin to that of the United States, she then, naturally, can join America in a common political system, to build sure guaranty for that greater destiny that such combination naturally and surely would bring to her. America in her own defense, in this newly changed world lately affected profoundly by the natural functioning of fundamental economic influences, could never consider union with any territories outside the natural boundaries of her own national economy, but she eventually and inevitably must insist upon this new step in Canada's behalf. The destiny of Canada and of America, herself, demands it.

The economic Horse of Troy landed on our shores years ago. The international salesmen soon made inroads in many of our colleges, organizations, and even into the two major political parties; and, to me one of the most dangerous—if not the most dangerous—is a plan that, if successful, will destroy the economic future of our country. I refer to the St. Lawrence River waterway—the free passage into the very heart of the United States. In our "cooling off" period—which has been suggested after this war—that is one issue that we should all cool off on and lay it away on ice. We all know our waterways, our ports, and our transportation would all suffer and many sections of our country would pass into economic obscurity. The Mississippi Valley is the market basket of the United States, and it may be the market basket of the world for many days to come. With the building of the St. Lawrence River waterway it would be national—if not international discrimination against this country—every vestige of our economic advantage would be surrendered to foreign flags and our potential economic enemies. The agenda to be laid on the peace table will clearly define many demands by Russia, England, China, and our other allies. As in the last war we may ask nothing; just what we got, and, just what we may get. After this war the demands will be very heavy on us. We have given much; and

we will give more. But we cannot ever surrender our economic independence.

The St. Lawrence River waterway, if built to the tune of the internationalists, will turn the Mississippi River traffic in reverse gear. This traffic now naturally goes down the river touching the docks of many American cities, finally offering itself to the marts of the world at the port of Louisiana's greatest city, New Orleans. The Mississippi River is an American river, serves the American Nation, and constitutes one of the greatest waterways in the world to make possible easy and natural handling—by Americans—of the fruits of the vast bulk of American farmers and industries. It brings lifeblood to the New Orleans port which, without the river's traffic, would shrivel as an important city. The river, naturally used, guarantees to America a great trade with our neighboring countries of South America. In these respects, Mississippi Valley traffic as now charted is an absolutely essential economic instrumentality for the prosperity of all of America.

On the other hand, the St. Lawrence waterway, peculiarly advocated by well-known internationalists—so-called—would divert this great stream of American commerce into channels immediately foreign, would allow the flags of foreign countries to enter into the very heart of our great country—there to dictate to us—the terms and conditions of their service; would allow an unfavorable competition with our own industry and commerce; and finally, by shunting the business northward and away from the normal, natural trends, would weld still another shackle upon the great Southland—already discriminated against by too many adverse economic influences. Gentlemen, we cannot allow, by this monstrous proposal, garbed as it is in a coat of sweet-scented internationalism, we cannot allow the Southern States of this country to be sacrificed to an unfair and unnatural and a cheap competition with foreign economies that pay nothing toward our well-being but, instead, seek to sap the substance from our own American economy. I predict, if the St. Lawrence waterway be completed, my Southland will be gutted economically to a point that without hope, we shall be abandoned forever as a perpetual sacrifice to a foolish foreign economic policy that never will be a benefit to our own great country.

Let us build America. Let us not vitiate her substance and her strength. Let us not have our land become a melting pot cracked by alien influences. Foreign peoples may be justly proud of their accomplishment in getting all they can from the world at large—let them parade to the martial tunes that stress their national pride. But let Americans be proud too—proud in their own individualism, proud in their own accomplishments, and proud in their determination, and in their protected ability to take care of themselves in this sorely troubled world. For only in such spirit can America become great in the sense that I know our people demand it shall be.

In concluding my remarks to you my colleagues, let me say that I have had

recent conversations in my State with the dairymen, the cotton farmers, the vegetable growers, the sugarcane growers, the rice planters, the strawberry farmers, the tobacco group, the oil producers, and others, representing the principal industrial activities of my home State, and I find they are all dissatisfied with conditions relating to inequities of price, marketing abuses, production restrictions, lack of efficient transportation facilities, burdens of official regulations and red tape, shortages of materials and equipment, fears of continued and increasing inflationary tendencies, high taxes, and so forth.

Now that my people complain of these tragic matters so demanding attention, let no man cry a charge of isolationism against my people. Such technique is often used successfully to conceal real purpose. But, my colleagues, no American is to be upbraided as a traitor to good cause among us, simply because he interests himself in American problems first and in general support of real Americanism to the exclusion, when necessary, of our own welfare, of foreign matters. While we busy ourselves with everybody else's business, while we become absorbed in the planners' plans for a sweet and happy post-war world, let us as legislators give heed to the entreaties and demands of our people, and pay a little attention to the problems of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANNON of Florida). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 25 minutes, under previous order of the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time and I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day on Monday next has been disposed of and at the conclusion of other special orders I may speak for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 10 minutes under previous special order of the House.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's message, a mimeographed copy of which consisting of 11 pages single-spaced I hold in my hand, contains much good advice which it would be well for him to follow.

I note that he tells us of the size of the war and of the difficulty of winning that war. In fact, he devotes several pages to that topic. See pages 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. Speaker, that—the size, the extent of this war—is something that most of us thought about, and seriously, before we got into this war. When we were playing around with the so-called lend-lease proportion, which was to keep us out of war, he, having in his possession all the facts at the time as he told us and again advising us to let him shape a policy to keep us out of war, must have known lend-lease was nothing but a

gift from the American people to whoever wanted to come and get it or whoever wanted to wait and have it sent to them. When he was talking about that and assuring us that our sons never would be sent to fight on foreign soil, many of us knew that the fighting of a battle or a war throughout the world would be a sizable task and that lend-lease and the shipment of munitions of war to one of the belligerents was an invitation to war.

Many of us knew, as he points out now, that the fighting of that kind of a war would involve questions of transportation, production of munitions, and of food such as had never before confronted any one nation or all the nations of this world.

He comes along now at this late day, after we are in it and cannot get out even if we wanted to, after we are in it, I repeat, and the sacrifices are being made by our people, and tells us that it is a sizable war which cannot be won in a few weeks or perhaps in a few months.

The President must have known, as did those who sought to avoid war, that it meant, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMMERS] once warned us, that we would wade through oceans of blood if ever we were in it.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, if it is not impertinent, that many of us who lacked education and experience and a world-wide knowledge, some of us who had never been out of our own States or counties, were told by our common sense and by our judgment that a world war would tax, would inevitably tax, the resources and the manpower of our Nation, or any combination of the richest nations in the world. Many of us knew then that men were going to die by the thousands because that always happens in war. It was inevitable in a world war that casualties would run into the millions.

The President now seems to have discovered the fact that a world-wide war cannot be won either by fireside chats or by New Deal planning. Yes, people throughout this country who heard the President's message, who read and who will reread it, will be encouraged if they can be assured in some way that he will read it again himself and sense what it means, then follow some of the suggestions there made.

True to form the President could not resist questioning the motives of some of us. Let me in reply say that never from this floor or elsewhere have I heard a Republican question the motive of the administration or of any of those who presume to announce its policies. Many of us, myself included, have questioned the good sense, the judgment, and the administrative ability of the President and his chief advisers, and some of us, including myself, continue to question it today.

Coming from home, as we have, let me venture the suggestion, too, that every single man who has returned from talking with his people can give illustration after illustration of the lack of common sense and sound judgment here in Washington which not only is today

hindering, but will in the near future hinder, the production of food and munitions.

Over here on page 10 I find three paragraphs in which the President questions the motive of a group of American people upon whose efforts the success of this war depends. For instance, there is this paragraph:

Some people, when a doughnut is placed before them, claim they can see only the hole in it. Sometimes this is an example of sheer individual pessimism; but sometimes it is caused by motives not consonant with war-winning ideals.

That is a charge that some of us do not want to win the war. It is a charge that is false and the President in his own mind knows it is false. I know of no one, and I met no one, and I challenge any Member to point to anyone in his own district, and there are some 400 Members in this body who visited their home districts, who gave any indication that he did not want to win this war or that we had anything else in our minds but the winning of the war.

I do know that there are hundreds of thousands, yes, many millions of people in this country, who honestly and sincerely believe, as a result of their own judgment and experience, that this war cannot be won if the New Deal methods which are now being employed continue in force. Those methods, instead of encouraging and increasing production, hinder and delay and, in some instances, stifle production.

The next two paragraphs of the President's message are along the same line, questioning the motive and creating disunity.

At the bottom of page 7, I find this statement:

Nothing we can do will be more costly in lives than to adopt the attitude that the war has been won—or nearly won.

Then over on the next page there is the following:

That is why I have always maintained that there is no such separate entity as the "home front."

Once more, let me state I am in full accord with what the President says there. There is no such separate entity as a home front. The home front is the foundation upon which the whole war effort rests.

For weeks and for months the administration has been deliberately destroying that foundation by its New Deal planning. We need only go back and show what all of our people at home know, how the planning and the orders and the directives and the regulations of this New Deal as promulgated from time to time have created a shortage of food, beef and butter and fats, everything down the line; coffee, when there was plenty of it in the southern countries that might have been brought in, but it would not come from the particular nation with which the President's advisers wanted to trade. How those directives have reduced the production of munitions!

Today we have the same policy at work. I can cite concrete example after

concrete example, and so can each and every Member of this body, showing just how the food supply is being cut off, and that production is being hindered.

Let me call to your attention one example I had up yesterday with Marvin Jones. In two little counties in Michigan they will have between 50,000 and 65,000 tons of grapes. The Army and the Navy want them, and rightfully, to go into food, and they want the food processors to take care of them. Every figure I mention and every fact I name in connection with this situation having to do with grapes will be verified by Leo V. Card, former Democratic agricultural commissioner of the State of Michigan and now on special duty down here, who has just returned from a personal investigation in those two counties.

The food processors, those who turn the grapes into food, into juice, jelly and jam, can take care of but 23,000 to 24,000 tons. Those are Card's figures. Twenty-six thousand tons of grapes will not be used either by the wineries or the food processors, and why? Because of a regulation promulgated down here that these grapes, fresh grapes—and this regulation takes effect on midnight of the 20th of this month—cannot go on the fresh market.

The result will be, unless there is a modification of the orders and the proposed orders, that 26,000 tons of grapes which otherwise would go on the fresh-grape market, be bought up by the housewives and a large proportion made into juice, jelly, or jam, will either rot or go into the black market and be found in the hands of makers of bootleg wine.

Today on the Benton Harbor market, which is the greatest fruit market between the Alleghenies and the Rockies, grapes are selling at \$1.50 per jumbo basket, equivalent to \$165 per ton, while the ceiling put upon the grapes sold by the farmer to the food processors is \$70 per ton, although New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania grape growers have a discriminatory price of an additional \$10 per ton.

Because of the corrupt and vicious political alliance between the C. I. O. and this administration, the farmers are to be compelled to sell their grapes at \$70 a ton to food processors, who can take care of less than half the crop, and let the others, worth \$165 a ton, rot or sell them to black-market operators.

This administration and the head of it have sold the farmer down the river in return for the political support of organized labor.

In addition to cheating the farmer, the administration is following a course which will deprive our soldiers of the food values which might have been produced from this grape crop.

A similar situation exists with reference to celery. Within the hour, I was notified from home that carloads of celery are ready for market. The buyers are ready to purchase, but they dare not purchase because they do not know what the ceiling price will be, and my advice from the Department—a Mr. Stanton—is that sometime within the next 2 or 3 weeks a price ceiling will be fixed.

Again we see the hand of the C. I. O. striking out to snatch from the farmer a decent return for his weeks and months of back-breaking toil in producing celery.

Did time permit, instance after instance of similar actions which hinder and delay, and in some cases halt completely, the production of food necessary to support the armed forces and the civilian population might be cited.

Yes; the President's message is full of good advice, and it is regrettable that neither he nor those who administer his policies have seen fit to recognize it, put it into force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I complained a few days ago that we were deprived time for discussion. I have therefore taken these few minutes now made available. I take it as much for the Members of the House as for myself, hoping that you will avail yourselves of the opportunity to interrupt for your own suggestion. Oh, "What small potatoes we all are, as compared to what we ought to be." The country is looking to us to do something.

I listened to the message today with a great deal of satisfaction. It was a heartening message on the whole. It was in the same tone as the message of January. We were told, in effect, that we ought to gloss over complaints. The hint was that we would be anything but good citizens if we complained; that there was lack of real patriotism among those who did complain. Certainly that was implied in the message.

If I were politically wise, perhaps I would hold my peace, but I am a Member of the Congress and my people certainly think I have some part in relation to the conduct of the home front.

Cheerfully I have voted for all that the military have requested in former days. During the last 3 weeks I was home I received many messages to deliver to the Congress. I should not fear to deliver them. Discretion is something you never learn until you are too old, when it does not do you any good. I will speak briefly of one or two matters.

I have said, and I repeat, that I am definitely opposed to the drafting of fathers until real necessity exists. I can then vote as I think proper. That is the way most of you seem to feel about this matter. Why hesitate to express yourselves? Your constituents are anxious to know what you intend to do about it.

I have told my people that I would ask some questions and may feel compelled to vote as the military may advise us.

After reading the discussion before the committee, I learn that the Army wants plenty of men, and do not care where they get them. I care very much from what source they are taken, and so do you. It is really within our province to say to the Army where they shall take them. That is our right; that is our privilege;

that is our duty, to determine where they shall take them. If there is no real necessity for breaking up homes and taking the fathers, let us not do it. You are not talking much about it—except privately, but it is plainly evident that most of you agree with me in that reasoning.

If we shall have a National Service Act, I may say to the gentleman from New York, then, they claim, they would have the power to take men, and put them where they ought to go in essential industry, but they hesitate to take your suggestion to ask for that power. Even today, they do not want to assume it, although they are again whispering about it and may recommend it if they fear that we may take direct action.

I do not want to be too sentimental, but I want to read something and have it appear in the *Record*. Here is a letter handed to me from a soldier. I think he represents the thoughts of most soldiers:

As the war starts on the upward road, in earnest, I find more and more, that the soldiers follow the news. Subject of hotness second only to John L. Lewis would be the drafting of fathers. For God's sake, is Congress to stand alone in trying to stop such an idiotic situation? Could it be true that Congress is looking to the fall elections, but whatever the motive they are certainly on the right track. For the first time I ask you to do something regarding the war effort—write a letter to all the Congressmen you can think of and tell them to bury that father-drafting foolishness. They've got twice too many men already—what are the big boys after; a finger on every man and his whole personal life and identity?

That soldier wants to do what is right and he wants us to do what is right. I must have some real information in order to answer that letter because, as I look about I see that there are many soldiers scattered all over this Nation doing a great deal of work that we thought the WAC's, and the WAVES, and the SPARS would do. Seemingly there are already too many in positions of that type. We should assume to ourselves more responsibility about manpower and food problems.

I do wish to ask questions. A great leader of the United States Senate states that he has been informed "off the record," and is satisfied with the assistance that our allies, below the Rio Grande, have given to the war effort. I ask why they are not permitting their soldiers to be sent overseas, and supported by their population. They have assured us that they are our allies. Can they not give a few soldiers for the front? Have our boys got to do all the fighting? Is that all we can expect under the good neighbor policy? They have declared war on the Axis partners. But I know this great Senator, who says that he has been told this "off the record" seems often to have capitulated at a minute's notice by a slight whisper from the White House. He is not a leader in the great Senate. It would seem that he is not so much the leader in the great Senate, as the leader delegated from the White House. Leading from there, they become our drivers, forcing us too often to go in directions con-

trary to our real desires. Oh, "What small potatoes we all are, as compared to what we ought to be," and, what our people think we ought to be. Let us wake up and exercise our authority. But, I should not complain, according to the message received today. We hear no mention of John Lewis holding up production and how damaging the results, and no comment on the remedy given by the Congress, even over a veto. There was simply a recital of the wonderful production brought about by whom? The Congress? Oh, no! The Executive and those whom he has appointed conduct it all. What have we done except to O. K. what the Executive wanted? I do not wish to make a political speech. If I followed the Democratic code and would say to him who complains, "you are not patriotic," he might say to me "I have two sons in the Solomons," or he might look at me and say, "This is my Government, and I expect efficiency." Is the administration so interested in the war, that they will make little attempt to correct the troubles on the home front? One man said that there was one war in history that he was perfectly satisfied with, and that was the Trojan war. It was about a woman. He understood the cause of that one.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Since speaking in the Well of the House, I have had a communication from my district and the celery growers there. The celery growers have carloads of celery now on the tracks. The buyers are there, and they want to buy, and the growers are there, and they want to sell, but down here they advise me, Mr. Stanton in the Department, that they cannot tell what the ceiling price will be for 2 weeks yet. Will the gentleman tell me what they are going to do with that celery that is in the cars?

Mr. GIFFORD. I am unable to suggest. The retail fish people had an item of instruction as to how much to charge for fish at retail. An editorial in the paper tried to explain it, but they said, "That it was as clear as mud but that perhaps the fish would understand it." That is too generally the situation. Our people are unable to understand this foolishness. The war effort has apparently taken attention from the home front or at least the time of the Executive seems to be so absorbed in military matters that the home front is not being taken care of. As I have said before, Marvin Jones and Prentiss Brown and others of our own former Members have been appointed to carry out the will of the President—"kicking us with our own feet." Marvin Jones came before our committee yesterday and wanted to pay subsidies for 3 or 6 months. Seemingly all at the committee meeting opposed this plan, but it is plainly evident that the administration seems determined to force us to accept it.

As a result of that meeting, we could come to no resolution thereon. That Mr. Jones must first consult somewhere

else before he could act seems apparent, although he is supposed to be food czar. However, they seem determined to force subsidies down our throats. It appears to matter little what we think. Will you assert yourselves? I might be willing to capitulate for 3 months. Milk must be produced, but I want to give notice that I shall capitulate for only 3 months. I realize how stubborn the President is. I realize his fight with John Lewis caused the hold-the-line order which has brought upon us so much trouble. I want the O. P. A. to raise the price of milk if necessary or reduce it when necessary, as we must have milk production. The hold-the-line order has rendered the O. P. A. and other agencies helpless to bring relief when common sense dictates necessity of action.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recall that Marvin Jones also said that he did not have authority to deal with it, and the only course he could pursue was to come to Congress and tell us his troubles.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. I asked him, "Are you not War Food Administrator?" He has no authority over O. P. A. Is that not a pity? The White House has to tell the O. P. A. and our friend Marvin must first get orders from there. And I suppose they are pretty busy down there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes. I want to ask him some questions about onions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANNON of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to ask the gentleman about onions. We realize that onions are a substantial part of the diet that the servicemen must have. Our growers are ready to harvest their onions. We want to know what about these ceiling prices. They tell us down at the Department that on the 22d there will be hearings about the ceiling price on onions, but what will we do with the onions in the meantime? Those crops are ready to be harvested and marketed. The growers want to sell and the buyers want to buy, but no one dares make a move. What are we to do with all this food while we are waiting for the Department down here?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not know. I had a long letter from the Department this morning about onions and other vegetables; information about ceiling prices, but I have many other sad letters on my desk which seem to me to be rather evasive. I much doubt if they know how to handle the problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How would it be if we took that authority away from the O. P. A.?

Mr. GIFFORD. Now, you are talking sense. If we have the power to set them up, have we not power to pass legislation restricting, instructing, and laying down

policy? Every day many complaints are placed before us. I think there should be emergency legislation passed quickly to bring relief to our people. We cannot go on as we are going. Food ready for harvest must be freed from impossible restrictions. I want the Congress to assume some of this burden, and our people demand that we do. I want to live happily with this administration. I want to back the President. We will have 4 years more of him, apparently. Drew Pearson said he would not run again, but the President shortly afterward called him a confirmed liar. So we must make the best of it all. I want to work in harmony with him. I want to help him. I do not wish to be critical. I greatly desire to be helpful. I want to help him out of this mess. His appointed czars seem to fight among themselves. He needs to have the help of the Congress in matters of policy. Let us rescue him. He is my President. I am not criticizing him on his military conduct of the war. I would not if I could. I am talking about the home front, which is largely your job and mine. Are you going to lie down on it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think that the President's political alliance with the C. I. O., and these other fellows, justifies charging 25 cents a week to the soldiers who volunteered to do canning?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, probably these votes are worth it. Remember that only last week we were told of their rising and applauding for 3 minutes for a fourth term. Labor. Labor which has endorsed WALLACE in taking down all barriers of trade and letting cheap goods come into the country. Labor with its demand for high wages, so blindly following. Following blindly. In the next election let us have an issue so strong that no matter who is nominated, we can win. If some courageous man would come forward and say, "I am running on a platform to cut out one-half or even one-third of the bureaus, and give the Government back to its rightful owners," he would not need a half-billion dollar smile and voice in order to win.

I close by begging you to help our President in these problems affecting the home front.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is asking someone to come forward on a platform to do away with some of the bureaucrats. Has the gentleman forgotten the President's promise and his campaign platform, where he promised economy and the curtailment of bureaucracy?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no; but he forgot it.

My people ask me why we in Congress do not do something. I read in the Reader's Digest the argument of our friend, the gentleman from Texas, HATTON SUMNERS, "Don't blame the bureaucrats!" All I can say is that we love the

gentleman from Texas, HATTON SUMNERS; we rise and applaud him when he makes a speech, but when he votes the way he talks it will be something to be joyful about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

STABILIZATION PLAN

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced a resolution, as a member of the Coinage Committee, requiring that in discussions and considerations for the formation of an international bank, a committee from Congress should be permitted to sit in and to learn of the understandings reached between the contracting nations. Up to the present time the Treasury Department has refused to approve the resolution which sought to create this special committee.

We now learn from London sources that a group of financial experts from England are here discussing the creation of this international bank, and I want to read to you a London dispatch dated September 14, which gave out this information to the American people. It is an Associated Press article from London, and reads as follows:

Two major financial plans—calling for establishment of an international institution for regulating investments, stabilization of world prices for major commodities—will be discussed by Lord Keynes, who now is in Washington for conferences with United States Treasury officials, it was reported yesterday.

The Financial News said Lord Keynes was accompanied by Sir Frederick Leith-Ross, Sir David Waley, Prof. Lionel Robbins, and other British experts. He is expected to make an effort to reach a compromise between the Keynes and the revised White currency stabilization plans.

The Financial News said the experts also would consider the creation of a bank for reconstruction of united and associated nations.

Such a bank would make long-term loans to countries where a scarcity of capital prevents adequate utilization of economic resources.

Lord Keynes is the author of a British plan which proposes to stabilize currency through an international clearing union which would have no assets, but would permit participation on the basis of each nation's world trade.

Apparently the Treasury officials in Washington were unwilling to give the news of the present conference to the American people, and therefore we were forced to get our news from London, which has been the source of a great deal of news in the past on financial and other problems.

It occurs to me that many things can be discussed at such a conference. I feel that the Members of Congress, the representatives of the people, should have an opportunity to sit in to learn what is going to be done to them.

Incidentally we have approximately \$22,000,000,000 worth of gold, most of which has been purchased from England and other countries of the world at inflated prices. No doubt the financial experts from England are here to tell us how to use our gold and other resources for the benefit of the rest of the world. "Me thinks" that the American people and Congress ought to have something to say about it. At a later date, when more information is available, I hope to have more to say about the English plan and the Treasury proposal for an international bank.

Secretary Morgenthau promised that before anything would be done he would come to the Congress and present a plan, because he thought it was only fair that he should come before the representatives of the people with his ideas. But the Congress will never learn of the secret agreements that are made or what is to be done by and between the international bankers under any plan cooked up in secret session by the financial wizards of the world. Secret understanding and plans kept under cover are dangerous to the future welfare of our country, and Congress should insist on having full information on arrangements being made at the present Treasury conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial entitled "Religion, Labor, and the Common Good," by A. F. Whitney.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) from September 20 to 22, inclusive, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 250. An act to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 357. An act to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 439. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 715. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved

January 29, 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 964. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications; to the Committee on Printing.

S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, September 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

708. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Washita River watershed in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, made by this Department, pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 275); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

709. A letter from the adjutant general, Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting the Journal of the Proceedings of the Seventy-sixth National Encampment, held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13-18, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 32); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

710. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two supplemental estimates of appropriation, totaling \$8,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, to remain available until expended, for the War Department for flood control (H. Doc. No. 274); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

711. A letter from the acting president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

712. A letter from the Associate Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements; for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, covering the appropriation "Maintenance, Executive Mansion and Grounds," as provided in

Independent Offices Appropriation Act, approved June 26, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

713. A letter from the Under Secretary, United States Department of the Interior, transmitting copies of revised estimates of personnel requirements, covering the quarter ending September 30, 1943, for various bureaus and offices of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

714. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$40,000 (H. Doc. No. 273); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

715. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the fourth monthly list of registrants who have been deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, as of August 15, 1943, in accordance with the provisions of subsection C of Public Law No. 23 (78th Cong.), approved April 8, 1943 (list prepared from reports submitted in the continental United States and the territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2972) to suspend, as respects vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, certain provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels of the United States, and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to settle and pay claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage and salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3223. A bill to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DREWRY:

H. R. 3224. A bill to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3225. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 3226. A bill to establish a Department of Air Defense, to establish the United States Air Forces as a separate branch of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3227. A bill to abolish the Office of War Information and transfer its functions to the Department of State; to the Committee

on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3228. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 3229. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3230. A bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3231. A bill to facilitate payment of unpaid retired pay of personnel of the armed services and to avoid needless clerical expenditures; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3232. A bill to fix maximum rents in the New York City defense-rental area at the September 1, 1942, level; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3233. A bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3234. A bill to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3235. A bill to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3236. A bill to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3237. A bill to permit the granting of beverage licenses in the District of Columbia to service clubs of other United Nations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3238. A bill to amend section 14 of the act entitled: "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, and to amend section 15 thereof, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3239. A bill to provide for the setting aside of convictions of Federal offenders who have been placed on probation and have fully complied with the conditions of their probation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3240. A bill to amend title IX of the act of March 27, 1942, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war," by adding a new section thereto providing free postage under certain conditions for persons serving in the armed forces of any foreign country with which the United States may be associated in the prosecution of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3241. A bill to implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign forces within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3242 (by request). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized

strength," approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3243. A bill to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3244. A bill to extend the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, in connection with the public lands, to certain persons serving in the merchant marine and to certain civilian workmen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 3245. A bill amending title II of the Social Security Act to provide for credit service in the armed forces for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 3256 (by request). A bill to provide for increases in the rates of payments of salaries, compensation, pension, retirement benefits, social-security benefits, and other monetary benefits not based on specific contracts by 10 percent of the basic amounts thereof for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living, as compared with the index figure of the cost of living during the first half of 1940, to be computed for each 6-month period following enactment, to be put into effect, prospectively, as of the 1st of the fourth month after each such 6-month period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to permit the importation from Canada, free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock feed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution directing the Price Administrator to make effective immediately the provision of Public Law 729, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that certain married servicemen on duty overseas be granted furloughs to visit their families; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to propose to the nations of the world the adoption of the Edwards Perpetual Calendar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Res. 301. Resolution providing additional compensation for the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Republic of Uruguay, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, with applause on the magnificent triumph of the cause of democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3246. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Wilder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3247. A bill for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 3248. A bill granting a pension to Fannie J. Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3249. A bill granting a pension to Birdie Ann Mock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3250. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court of Maine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOCH:

H. R. 3251. A bill for the relief of Harry F. Gracey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3252. A bill granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3253. A bill for the relief of Clay Guthrie and Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTINGER:

H. R. 3254. A bill granting a pension to Ernest Manley Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 3255. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Devo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2163. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Emily B. Stokes and 582 citizens of Woodbury, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2164. Also, petition of Edna M. Souers and 516 citizens of New Philadelphia, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2165. Also, petition of Zura Peck and 71 citizens of Meyersdale, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2166. Also, petition of Jessie Ward Davis and 50 citizens of Patterson, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2167. Also, petition of W. L. Moody and 82 citizens of Wood River, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2168. Also, petition of William Schooley and 80 citizens of Rosemead, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2169. Also, petition of LeRoy A. Sheldon and 164 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2170. Also, petition of Mrs. D. R. Brazel and 22 citizens of Alton, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2171. Also, petition of Ray P. Watt and 116 citizens of Inglewood, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2172. Also, petition of Alice Price Logare and 39 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2173. Also, petition of Gertrude Chambless and 85 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2174. Also, petition of Mrs. Joseph C. Hummer and 20 citizens of Titusville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2175. Also, petition of Mrs. H. R. Wilton and 82 citizens of Charlotte, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2176. Also, petition of Rilla B. Cox and 21 citizens of Wymore, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2177. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Burlingame and 35 citizens of Cincinnati, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2178. Also, petition of Elsie Barthel and 50 citizens of Watervliet, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2179. Also, petition of Lena M. Lisle and 39 citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2180. Also, petition of Lula Rae Wiser and 14 citizens of Beloit, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2181. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles F. Tate and 61 citizens of Chandler, Ariz., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2182. Also, petition of Inez Ware and 50 citizens of Stafford, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2183. Also, petition of Mrs. O. P. Burbes and 165 citizens of Nickerson and Sterling, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2184. Also, petition of Mrs. A. M. Fombelle and 30 citizens of Wooster, Ohio, urging en-

actment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2185. Also, petition of Mattie Brumfield and 39 citizens of Winchester, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2186. Also, petition of Paul B. Stone and 41 citizens of Kallispell, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2187. Also, petition of 139 citizens of Nickerson, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2188. Also, petition of 123 members of the Oregon Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2189. Also, petition of 88 members of the First Baptist Church of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2190. Also, petition of Mrs. R. C. Garner and 107 citizens of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2191. Also, petition of 195 citizens of Worthington, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2192. Also, petition of Hazel D. Stanton and 40 citizens of San Pedro, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2193. Also, petition of Mrs. Howard Hughey and 67 citizens of Greenville, Ill., urging

enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2194. Also, petition of Mary K. Brown and 36 citizens of Los Gatos, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2195. Also, petition of 17 members of the Woodlawn Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2196. Also, petition of Edward E. Washburn and 40 citizens of Newfield, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2197. Also, petition of Mrs. C. E. Burts and 24 citizens of Anderson, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2198. Also, petition of Verna Willey and 20 citizens of Industry, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2199. Also, petition of Jennie M. Price and 50 citizens of Oakland, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2200. Also, petition of Mrs. A. H. Owen and 50 citizens of Newfield, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2201. Also, petition of Cora Marsh and eight citizens of Creston, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2202. Also, petition of Rev. V. C. Mulkin and 40 citizens of Madison, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2203. Also, petition of Mrs. E. M. Hall and 17 citizens of Weston, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2204. Also, petition of 65 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Burlington Union in Vermont, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2205. Also, petition of E. S. Roxburgh and 72 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2206. Also, petition of Alice S. Williams and 74 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2207. Also, petition of Mrs. Walter Hall and 443 citizens of Salam, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2208. Also, petition of Grace Peterson and 62 citizens of Hermitage, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2209. Also, petition of Bertha L. Harris and 36 citizens of Leesburg, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2210. Also, petition of Fannie Nixon and 72 citizens of Cedaredge, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2211. Also, petition of Mrs. George Peters and six citizens of Mercersburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2212. Also, petition of Viola M. Currier and 40 citizens of San Bernardino, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2213. Also, petition of Raymond E. Cunningham and 24 residents of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2214. Also, petition of Rhoda Yocom and 43 citizens of Adrian, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2215. Also, petition of Mrs. S. T. Dundore and 48 citizens of Millersburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2216. Also, petition of Rev. J. J. Keiser and 25 citizens of Anoka, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2217. Also, petition of Gertrude Mason and 41 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Castle Rock, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2218. Also, petition of Mrs. George Wolfenden and 20 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2219. Also, petition of Kate J. Alonso and 132 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Gainesville, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the

duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2220. Also, petition of Sara Howanstone and 40 citizens of Newport, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2221. Also, petition of Mrs. W. K. Love and 41 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2222. Also, petition of Olive E. Curtis and 20 citizens of Beaumont, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2223. Also, petition of Mary Waddell and 35 citizens of Mansfield, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2224. Also, petition of Mrs. Adah L. Riley and 26 citizens of Nashport, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2225. Also, petition of Mrs. O. J. Skrain and 120 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2226. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. G. W. Hassler and 116 citizens of Chambersburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2227. Also, petition of Grace F. Watkins and 45 citizens of Chesapeake City, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2228. Also, petition of Rev. Joseph W. Barton and 54 citizens of Overlea, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2229. Also, petition of Mrs. David Haskele and 40 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2230. Also, petition of Lydia Rux and 41 citizens of Greeley, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2231. Also, petition of Della Henry and eight citizens of Phillipsburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2232. Also, petition of Mrs. Obert Tweten and 23 citizens of Glyndon, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2233. Also, petition of Isabelle Tebbe and 11 citizens of Yreka, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2234. Also, petition of Mrs. Arthur May and 18 citizens of Solway, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2235. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. George Whisler and 50 citizens of Bluford, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2236. Also, petition of Mrs. A. L. Smith and 39 citizens of Atlanta, Ga., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the committee on the Judiciary.

2237. Also, petition of Flora Ramos and eight citizens of Arroyo, P. R., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2238. Also, petition of Myrtle K. Arnold and 41 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging

enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2239. Also, petition of Mrs. R. C. Garner and 61 citizens of Maplewood and Hannibal, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2240. Also, petition of Mr. S. H. Magill and 19 citizens of Petersburg, Alaska, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2241. Also, petition of Mrs. D. J. McCanne and 21 citizens of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2242. Also, petition of Rev. K. Dunkelberger and 27 citizens of Washougal, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2243. Also, petition of Anna M. Sweet and 50 citizens of Herkimer, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2244. Also, petition of 100 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2245. Also, petition of Anna C. Almy and 21 citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2246. Also, petition of Mrs. Carl Orthner and 69 citizens of Burlington, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2247. Also, petition of Mable Glaque and 42 citizens of Brush, Colo., urging enact-

ment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2248. Also, petition of Mrs. R. P. Ingraham and 20 citizens of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2249. Also, petition of Mr. V. K. Beshge-tor and 152 citizens of Alma, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2250. Also, petition of Mayor R. H. Wallace of Amoret, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2251. Also, petition of Agnes Smith and 30 citizens of Killbuck, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2252. Also, petition of Mr. W. E. Speaker and citizens of East Liverpool, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2253. Also, petition of Mrs. Lacy McKinney and 45 citizens of Basin, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2254. Also, petition of Mrs. A. G. Buley and 20 citizens of Glenville, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2255. Also, petition of Rev. H. E. Weaver and 18 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2256. Also, petition of Rev. Albert B. Benton and the Christian Churches of Youngstown, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill

2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2257. Also, petition of Annie L. Shepherd and 42 citizens of Springfield, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2258. Also, petition of Eva I. Williams and 20 citizens of Cato, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2259. Also, petition of L. R. Collins of Jackson, Miss., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2260. Also, petition of Mrs. H. I. Cecil and 36 citizens of Saint Paul, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2261. Also, petition of Mrs. N. J. Snaby and 21 citizens of Peterson, Minn., urging enactment of House bill, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2262. Also, petition of 10 members of the Methodist Church, Mora, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2263. Also, petition of Edward I. Besecker and 53 citizens of Maryland and Pennsylvania, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2264. Also, petition of Mrs. H. D. West and 15 citizens of Bowman, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2265. Also, petition of Mrs. Garner and 260 citizens of Missouri and Illinois, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the win-

ning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2266. Also, petition of Mrs. C. M. Betchie and 7 citizens of Cedarville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2267. Also, petition of Raymond Keys and 50 citizens of Winchester, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2268. Also, petition of Rev. Ezra Budke and 71 citizens of Waseca, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2269. Also, petition of Margaret B. Rife and 26 citizens of Cedarville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2270. Also, petition of J. B. Rife and 23 citizens of Cedarville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2271. Also, petition of Rev. Everett J. Spring and 180 citizens of Edinburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2272. Also, petition of Ella H. Llewellyn and 19 citizens of Hatboro, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2273. Also, petition of Mrs. O. E. Crandall and 80 citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2274. Also, petition of Mrs. C. E. Ryan and 203 citizens of Brule, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed

production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2275. Also, petition of Mrs. A. F. Fredin and 32 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2276. Also, petition of Mrs. George Dahl and 10 citizens of Littlefork, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2277. Also, petition of Margery H. Adams and 24 citizens of Townville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2278. Also, petition of Florence Evans and 23 citizens of Merion, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2279. Also, petition of Olive N. Pettit and 42 citizens of Harrisburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2280. Also, petition of Mrs. Henry F. Jacobs and 131 citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2281. Also, petition of Grace Carpenter and 51 citizens of Hemlock, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2282. Also, petition of Mrs. J. B. Boyd and 40 citizens of Bellare, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill, 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2283. Also, petition of Sophia G. Amsbury and 21 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and

speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2284. Also, petition of the Woman's Progressive Bible Class of Trinity Methodist Church, Berkeley, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2285. Also, petition of Minnie Hanson and 46 citizens of Bellingham, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2286. Also, petition of Mrs. E. G. Nabell and 30 citizens of East Point, Ga., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2287. Also, petition of L. W. Seaback and 33 citizens of Santa Ana, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2288. Also, petition of Mary Jenkins and 78 citizens of Pasadena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2289. Also, petition of Mrs. H. J. Riordan and 10 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2290. Also, petition of L. E. Rambo and 146 citizens of Raymondville, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2291. Also, petition of Grace M. Melton and 19 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2292. Also, petition of Reginald Shepley and 46 citizens of Greenville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2293. Also, petition of Ernest W. Peterson and 30 citizens of Ashtabula, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2294. Also, petition of Mrs. J. O. Woolf and 45 citizens of Elmira, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2295. Also, petition of Lera V. Burmerster and 60 citizens of Des Plaines, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2296. Also, petition of Mrs. Herbert Tice and 200 citizens of Sullivan, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2297. Also, petition of 19 members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service, Elsberry Methodist Church, Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2298. Also, petition of Mrs. C. W. Fletcher and 63 citizens of Felicity, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2299. Also, petition of Mrs. E. L. Bishop and 20 citizens of Colorado Springs, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2300. Also, petition of Mrs. Ida Witner and 140 citizens of Wingate, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2301. Also, petition of Mrs. Clara B. Newcomb and 40 citizens of Cherry Creek, N. Y.,

urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2302. Also, petition of Mrs. Nora Berringer and 21 citizens of Brunswick, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2303. Also, petition of Rev. F. T. Reed and 115 citizens of Weston, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2304. Also, petition of Mrs. C. W. Clift and 28 citizens of Harlingen, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2305. Also, petition of Mrs. G. E. Walston and 32 citizens of Atwater, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2306. Also, petition of Mr. B. V. Edmonty and 48 citizens of Plains, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2307. Also, petition of Mrs. Blanche McGee and 20 citizens of Greensburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2308. Also, petition of Mrs. Curtis Henderson and 30 citizens of Sherwood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2309. Also, petition of Mrs. Gwendoline A. Thompson and 60 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2310. Also, petition of Mrs. C. P. Ely and 21 citizens of Westerville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2311. Also, petition of Mrs. J. B. Boyd and 58 citizens of Bellaire, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2312. Also, petition of Lydia Hill and 20 citizens of Oakland, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2313. Also, petition of Minnie Dawley and 22 citizens of Forestville, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2314. Also, petition of Lucy G. Whitwell and 62 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2315. Also, petition of Mary H. Taft and 21 citizens of Montgomery, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2316. Also, petition of Garner's Music Store and 133 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2317. Also, petition of Mrs. William E. Wood and 18 citizens of Graston, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2318. Also, petition of Edward E. Blake and 54 citizens of Eugene, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2319. Also petition of Mr. John M. Sorensen and 21 citizens of Colorado Springs,

Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2320. Also, petition of the Adult Bible Class of Finksburg Church, Finksburg, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2321. Also petition of Mrs. T. J. Hisel and 20 citizens of Purdin, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2322. Also, petition of Mr. Richard C. Stockes and 51 citizens of Royal Oak, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2323. Also petition of Mrs. Stella Evans and 38 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2324. Also petition of Mrs. Minnie Baertsch and 21 citizens of Kalispell, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2325. Also petition of Rev. Wm. L. McGlasson and 19 citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2326. Also, petition of Claude A. Watson and 17 citizens of Everett, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2327. Also, petition of Franklin Price and 20 citizens of Moosic, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2328. Also, petition of W. R. Griswold and 23 citizens of West Union, W. Va., urging

enactment of House bill 2082 a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2329. Also, petition of 50 citizens of Kalispell, Mont., sent to Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD, urging enactment of House bill 2082 a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2330. Also, petition of Mary E. Dugan and 33 citizens of Bellingham, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2331. Also, petition of Jennie E. Hovey and 30 citizens of South Fork, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2332. Also, petition of Minnie Baertsch and 57 citizens of Kalispell, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2333. Also petition of Mrs. W. H. Kniefel and 20 citizens of Parma, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2334. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition signed by some 50 persons in Niagara County, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2335. Also, letters from the "Friend" Manufacturing Co., Gasport, N. Y., and the M. J. Grass Screw Machine Products Co., Buffalo, N. Y., urging changes in the existing laws having to do with renegotiation of contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2336. Also, communication received from the firm of Hickman, Coward & Wattles, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y., outlining the views of the dairy business favoring passage of House bill 2400; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2337. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of Joseph Lemma & Sons, Inc., and other residents of Oregon, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2338. Also, petition of Oregon Woman's Christian Temperance Union asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2339. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Andrew Baum and 40 St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2340. Also, petition of Adolph Wohlbrett and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to

enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2341. Also, petition of Mrs. Jos. Hauser and 40 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2342. Also, petition of L. Schroeder and 42 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2343. Also, petition of E. Hahn and 23 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2344. Also, petition of Clyde Stemmermann and 19 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2345. Also, petition of the St. Louis Mailers Union No. 3 and 31 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2346. Also, petition of Mrs. Frank R. Bellow and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2347. Also, petition of Ernie H. Meininger and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2348. Also, petition of Mary Hays and 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2349. By Mr. GIFFORD: Petition of sundry citizens of New Bedford protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2350. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition signed by 42 citizens of Paducah, Ky., urging early and favorable consideration of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2351. Also, petition signed by 130 members of the First Methodist Church of Mayfield, Ky., asking that legislation be passed prohibiting the sale and advertising of liquors in any form and prohibiting the distribution of unwholesome and vicious moving pictures and magazines detrimental to the young people of America, both in Army and civilian life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2352. By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of Suffolk, Va., in support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2353. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Suffolk, Va., in support of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2354. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Mrs. Isabel M. Koetter, of Dumont, N. J., and 23 other citizens of Bergen County, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2355. Also, petition of Mrs. Elizabeth A. DuRio and 25 other residents of Closter, N. J., requesting the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2356. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Association of Retired Federal Civil Service Employees, San Francisco, Calif., urging the Congress of the United States to recognize the urgent necessity of granting relief to the Federal civil-service employees in the lower brackets, and recommending passage of

House bill 2195 and Senate bill 878; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2357. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Theodore L. Sushka and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., in opposition to the passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2358. Also, petition of patrons of Eddie's Lunch, of Wheeling, W. Va., in opposition to the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2359. Also, petition of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Follansbee, W. Va., in opposition to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2360. Also, petition of the Allegheny Club, of Wheeling, W. Va., in opposition to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2361. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Petition signed by the residents of White Plains, N. Y., urging early consideration of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2362. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of R. P. Essman and 87 others, urging early consideration and a favorable vote on House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2363. Also, petition of Bud's Grill, Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2364. Also, petition of Aquila Aerie, No. 2290, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2365. Also, petition of the Hill Distributing Co., of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2366. Also, petition of J. Henry Mann and 34 others, urging early consideration and a favorable vote on House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2367. Also, petition of Ella Foltz and 19 others, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2368. Also, petition of the Scioto Distributing Co., of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2369. By the SPEAKER: Petition of State Camp of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the flag salute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2370. Also, petition of William J. Bennet, counselor of law, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to admission to the United States of aliens who are religious refugees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2371. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of citizens of Charleston, W. Va., urging the early consideration and favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and loving Father, who hast folded back the curtain of another night and given us once again the promise of a new day, be gracious to hear our prayer and accept our praise; we would refresh our minds and spirits by regaining the teachings of our Lord. Grant that we may not be too blind to

see or too deaf to hear; O give us the power to will and the will to wait.

Today we are turning one of the great bends of history; while the road is long and the hills steep and rough, guide us into the highways of a courageous conviction that we may help to lift the motley multitudes from their abyss of human woe and degradation. Blessed Lord, there is something within us which declares that if Thy Spirit had been in the souls of the nations, these tragic, crimson years could not have stained the fair face of this weeping world. O lead us to choose the best and the supreme, and undergird us until we cross the threshold of escape from deathful clods into deathless service. O God of wisdom and the Father of us all, be in the deliberation of this day. In the holy name of our Master, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 17, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1203. An act to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM IN ITS RELATION TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 303), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 294 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and continued by House Resolution 18 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the national defense program in its relation to small business in the United States, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000 additional including expenditures for the employment of experts, investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or any subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker—

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.